THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY
3 1151 02676 4021

MORAVIA
SPEC. COLL.

89375

Library
of the
Johns Hopkins University

Phases of
Oblique Predication in Greek

a Dissertation

Presented to the Board of University Studies of
the Johns Hopkins University for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By
Alfred William Milden.

Baltimore, June, 1899.

JHU THESIS
Milden,
Alfred Wm.
1899
c.1

Received June 3

Phases
of
Oblique Predication
in
Greek

by
Alfred Wm. Milden.

89.375

Contents

Page.

Introduction. 2.

The Greek Article. 4.

Oblique Predication in the Attic Orators. 23.

The Origin of the Adv.-Dat. Type of Pred. 33.

The Adverb. Dat. Type of Predication. 48-71.

in (a) Classical Greek 48.

(b) Late Greek. 66.

The Prepositional Type of Predication. 73-112.

in (a). Classical Greek. 73.

(b). Late Greek. 104.

Conclusion. 113.

Introduction.

One of the greatest of modern scholars in the department of Greek, F. Blass(1) says that even scholars of the present day are still so far from understanding ordinary Greek prose that they even fail to understand this most elementary thing, the Article. He adds: "es verdiente doch ganz gewiss etwas mehr stets und mehr noch stets bei seinem Grund dargemacht werden möge". And this is the attitude of mind of the most recent investigators.

The writer in common with others who have studied any of the phases of the Greek Article must acknowledge his especial obligations to the work of Krüger among the older grammarians. Kühner also was found to be helpful. Bishop Middleton's book(2) entitled "The Doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament" was read. Scientifically however, it proved to be valueless.

---

(1) Demosthenische Studien, Rhein. Mus. vol. 44 (1889), p. [illegible]

(2) with notes, etc., by H. J. Rose B.D., London. 1841.

very instructive on the other hand, was the treatise of S. Dornseiffen De Articulo apud Graecos eiusque usu in praedicato Amstelodami 1856.

Some additional literature on the Article which the writer has read may be cited here.

Stein De Articuli apud Pindarum usu Vratis.
Fuller A.L. De Articuli in Antiquis Graecis Poematis usu, Leipzig 1888.
Blass Fr. Demosthenische Studien Rhein. Mus. vol. 44, p. 1 ff.
Kallenberg H. Der Artikel bei Namen von Ländern Städten und Meeren in der griech. Prosa. Philol. 49 515 ff.
" Studien über den griech. Artikel, I. Berlin, [illegible]
Sieckermann Ueber den Artikel bei Eigennamen in den Komödien des Aristophanes. [illegible]
Kallenberg H. Der Artikel bei πᾶς, ὅλος, ἕκαστος [illegible] Jahresber. d. phil. Verein zu Berlin [illegible]
American Journal of Philology — several articles.

The Greek Article.

Most scholars of the present day who have given any attention to this much neglected, and consequently little understood, phenomenon of the speech of the acutest nation in the history of the world will accept, as correct, the statement that the Article in Greek is essentially demonstrative in its origin. Comparative grammar reveals the same fact. What in classical Greek is known as the Article is, for the most part, in Homer a demonstrative pronoun; nevertheless instances do occur in which the Article carries with it the significance, as well as the forms, of later usage. From the point of view of Attic Greek, we should be inclined to say that Epic Greek is wont to dispense with the Article. Not so. In Epic Greek the Article is implicit in the noun. This implicit Article is both particular and generic. Latin is a good illustration of it, for Latin never went beyond this stage. In the analytic tend-

opment of the language, the particular Article becomes increasingly necessary. The generic Article on the other hand remains largely implicit. Demonstrative in its origin, the Article never wholly loses its demonstrative force in its subsequent history.

Having briefly treated, in general terms, the origin of the Greek Article, I will now speak more specifically of its nature and function of its uses. For this undertaking, it is my good fortune to have at hand the excellent treatise of Dornseiffen(1), which was very serviceable to such grammarians as Krüger and Kühner and is still well worth knowing. This work received great recognition from A. Proksch(2) fifteen years after its publication, whose contribution was reviewed by Thos. R. Price(3). Proksch finds the results of Dornseiffen verified and corroborated by his own investigation. The essential function of the Article in Attic Greek is characterized by Price, on the basis of Dornseiffen, as follows.

---

(1) De Articulo apud Graecos eiusque usu in Praedicato; Amstelodami, [illegible]

(2) Über den Gebrauch des Artikels insbesondere beim Prädicat. Philologus vol. XL. pp. [illegible]

(3) Am. Journal of Philology, vol. IV. p. [illegible] ff.

"The article serves to define that which is known, or assumed to be known, either by its properties or relations." [illegible] defines it p. 8, thus: "Articulus Graecus igitur ab Atticis nominibus substantivis praeponebatur, ea quidem vi ut notum id cui praepo[illegible] *visu*, *auditu vel alio quodam modo omnibus suis numeris cognitum* indicaret, non eam quae reliquorum pronominum demonstrativorum est, sed levi ac presso simplici demonstratione. Ita ὁ ἄνθρωπος est is homo, quem ego vel tu vel alii animo vel oculis videmus, sive tanquam cognitum proponimus, sive unus homo, ex toto illud cognitum suis fine limitibus circumscriptum hominum genus hoc nomine complectimur. Sine articulo significatur incognitus aliquis vel quem ad quamcumque causam tanquam non definitum propono, vel quem definiri non cupio, vel etiam

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] qui hanc ad [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in qua, licet per grammaticos in innumeras fere partes divisa, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] eius usus nititur." These words, in my judgment, correctly set forth the significance of the Article in Attic Greek from a logical point of view.

We are not obliged, however, to look to modern times for a proper appreciation of the [illegible] characteristic of the Article. Modern grammarians have [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in the work of classification. One of the ancient Alexandrian grammarians, Apollonius Dyscolus, treats of the Article in the first book of his Syntax. His views have been presented by Otto Eichhorst[1] in an article reviewed by [illegible][2] Apollonius finds that the essential characteristic of the Article is its ἀναφορά or ἀναπόλησις i.e., a bringing back before the mind the conception of some

---

[1] [illegible] vol. XXXVIII, pp. 349–422.

(2) Am. Journ. of Philology, vol. 1, p. 231 ff.

third person already mentioned". The person or thing which is named at first without the Article has the Article to itself when it appears again in the discourse. He exemplifies the use of the Article as follows: [illegible] σιν (3) κατ' ἁπλῆν ἀναφοράν. He also anticipated modern grammarians in distinguishing between the generic and the particular Article.

According to [illegible], whose definition of the force of the Article in Attic Greek I have accepted, it is necessary to note the important consequences of this definition. [illegible] ff. proceeds to define the subject and the predicate: Subiectum est de quo aliquid dicitur, de quo sermo est, [illegible] primaria cum absolutum aliquid enunciaturi sumus: Praedicatum id quod de eo subiecto dicitur, est genus illud indefinitum ad quod subiectum, vice plane definita, refertur. It follows, in accordance with the defi-

nition of the Article, that the Article belongs naturally to the subject, that can not be connected with the predicate, unless the predicate be identical with the subject. And this is the conclusion which is reached by [illegible] viz., that the significance of the Article in the predicate is always that of identity or practically absence of identity with the subject. [illegible] has made a close examination of a large number of passages from various authors. The fact must not be lost sight of in this connection, that we are speaking entirely from the Greek standpoint, for the modern languages are not in the least degree averse to using the Article with the predicate just as they would use it with the subject.

Let us look at the Article from another point of view, the rhetorical. We are in a position to know how the ancient rhetoricians

regarded the Article. They saw in it a contrivance to avoid ambiguity. The prime requisite, as we know, of a good prose style is clearness. It is necessary, among other things, that no doubt should arise as to which part constitutes the subject or the predicate. The Article removes the doubt. Accordingly the chief function of the Article, from the rhetorical point of view, is to distinguish the subject from the predicate. In proof of our statement we have the express testimony of one of the oldest of the Greek rhetoricians, Theon[1] in his Progymnasmata. Theon has been treating of the means of avoiding ambiguity, and showing how a failure to observe certain rules brings about this undesirable result. Among the examples he cites from the first [illegible] of [illegible]

εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι Κόλχοι[2]

His objection to this Greek is best given in his own words:

---

(1) Spengel Rhetores Graeci, vol. II. p. 83.

(2) I have not found these words, [illegible]
[illegible]

ἄδηλον γὰρ πότερον οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι Κολχοί εἰσιν ἢ τοὐναντίον οἱ Κολχοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γενικῆς καὶ δοτικῆς,

Κολχῶν δὲ ὄντων Αἰγυπτίων καὶ
Κολχοῖς δὲ οὖσιν Αἰγυπτίοις·

ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς αἰτιατικῆς (this he had considered already) [illegible] τῶν ἄλλων πτώσεων φανερόν, ὅτι προσθέσει ἄρθρων αὐτίκα ἀναφαίνεται γένεσις ἢ θέσις· εἰσὶν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι οἱ Κολχοί· δῆλον γὰρ γέγονεν, ὅτι περὶ Κολχῶν λέγει, ὡς εἰσιν Αἰγύπτιοι.

We see clearly from these words of a Greek grammarian that the Article, not only in the nominative but also in the oblique cases, was regarded as an essential element in the predicating between subject and predicate.

Having treated of the origin and nature of the Article, I will now discuss briefly some of its uses. In so doing it will be necessary

to notice the position of the adjective in relation to the Article. This may be either attributive or predicative. The attributive position is a threefold one. We may have, e.g. (1) ὁ ἀγαθὸς παῖς, (2) ὁ παῖς ὁ ἀγαθός, (3) παῖς ὁ ἀγαθός. The first is the most usual position. The second is called the emphatic. The third is the "appended" or epithetical. It is commonly used as characteristic of Herodotus. As the first two, we have some very valuable testimony from an ancient critic of the highest ability, e.g., Aristotle(1). He tells us that, if one would be concise, he says, e.g., τῆς ἡμετέρας γυναικός. If one wishes his style to have ὄγκος (swelling, pomp, grandeur, dignity and fulness) he says, e.g., τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς ἡμετέρας. The third position is not mentioned by Aristotle. It is only distinguishable from the second when the Article has attained its full development. In poetry we frequently find

---

(1) Rhetoric 1407 b 35, 36 and 37.

what is called the third position; the truth is however, that the Article may still be implicit here, so that we virtually have the second or restrictive position. The predicative position, as it is called, is a twofold one. Krüger[1] has denominated this "Prädicativer Gebrauch des Artikels"; over against it, is to be set "Appositiver und attributiver Gebrauch des Artikels". The former expression is, to say the least, misleading. It is not the Article, but the adjective, which occupies the predicative position. In making use, therefore, of this expression we refer not to the Article but to the adjective. The twofold predicative position may be illustrated thus:

ἀγαθὸς ὁ παῖς.
ὁ παῖς ἀγαθός.

The use, or the omission, of the copula here is not of the slightest consequence. In both these examples, the adjective not only holds the predicative position, but also carries with it predicative signifi

---

(1) Griechische Sprachlehre § 50, 1. und 50, 7.

cation. It is the use of the Article which enables us to distinguish subject and predicate. Without the Article we should not be able to pronounce as to whether the adjective were an ordinary attributive or a predicative attributive. Only in this way may the expression 'Predicative use of the Article' be justified. But words may occupy the predicative position so called without conveying a predicative signification. At this point the writer is quite well aware that he is entering disputed territory. Examples of this usage are the familiar demonstratives οὗτος, ὅδε, and ἐκεῖνος. They are used appositively. Again ἄκρος, μέσος, and ἔσχατος are often considered instances of the predicative use of the adjective in contradistinction to the attributive use. Both Krüger[1] and Kühner[2] have advocated this view. No one will object to the differentiation which is made, according as the adjective stands attributively or predicatively e.g.:

τὸ ἄκρον ὄρος the high mountain, ἄκρον τὸ ὄρος the

---

[1] Historisch-philologische Studien, vol. II. p. 105.

[2] Kühner-Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik d. Griech. Sprach

top of the mountain. But here, again, the writer holds that, in such a case as the foregoing, we have apposition and predication. The apposition is predicative in its character.

A word may be in place here with reference to the term "Tertiary Predicates," which has obtained currency in certain grammars, for such predicative types as have formed the subject of our investigation. An English scholar, Donaldson(1), sees in Greek three distinct classes of predicates which he terms

(1) Primary, when there is nothing between the subject and the predicate, except the copula, either expressed or implied: e.g.,

οἱ λόγοι ψευδεῖς εἰσιν.

(2) Secondary, when the predicate is connected with the subject through a verb which already contains a primary predicate: e.g.,

οἱ λόγοι ψευδεῖς ἐλέχθησαν.

"The words were spoken, and they were false" = "The words which

---

(1) Greek Grammar 404 & 414 and New Cratylus p. 475 ff.

were spoken were false". He comments here that two circumstances are predicated of λόγοι, first the utterance, and secondly the falsity; consequently, ψευδεῖς is a secondary predicate.

(3) Tertiary, when the whole of the secondary predication is subordinated to a primary predication which refers to a different subject:

ὁ μάντις τοὺς λόγους ψευδεῖς λέγει.

"The prophet speaks words and they are false" — "The words which the prophet speaks are false." This is explained as follows: the secondary predication οἱ λόγοι ψευδεῖς λέγονται is attached, by a crasis, to the primary predication ὁ μάντις λέγει, i.e., ἐστὶ λέγων, "the prophet is speaking". The object of this ἡ λῆψις is the accusative case λόγους; and cases of nouns, as predicating obviously some secondary relation, are themselves secondary predicates. Hence the ψευδεῖς is rightly termed a tertiary predicate, and the ψεῦδος is contained in the adjective ψευδεῖς and not in the accusative.

This classification of predicates as primary, secondary, tertiary is clearly due to the application of logic to grammar. Let us examine it a little more closely. What do primary, secondary and tertiary mean here? Certainly not primary, secondary and tertiary in importance, for the tertiary predicate is of primary importance in all these cases. Evidently reference is made to the order of times of thought. We might well call them first, second, and third. The sound has disappeared, the significance never was there. It is better to continue to consider these predicates from the Greek point of view.

(1) οἱ λόγοι ψευδεῖς εἰσιν.

The Article distinguishes the subject from the predicate.

(2) οἱ λόγοι ψευδεῖς ἐλέχθησαν.

The words being false were spoken =

The words that were spoken were false.

ψευδεῖς is the stronger expression. It becomes the predicate.

(3) ὁ μάντις τοὺς λόγους ψευδεῖς λέγει

The predicate remains the same. Likewise the subject, which the Article enables us to recognize. Its case, of course, is not the nominative but the accusative, an oblique case. This, however, makes no difference from the point of view of Greek. We need only remember the main function of the Article. The apparent subject is ὁ μάντις which quickly falls back as the thought advances. All that we can do in English is to recast the sentence in order to represent it to ourselves, as follows:

ὁ μάντις τοὺς λόγους ψευδεῖς λέγει =
οἱ λόγοι οὓς ὁ μάντις λέγει ψευδεῖς εἰσιν.

In this way the words ὁ μάντις λέγει naturally from our point of view, assume their subordinate role. The subtle Greek did not find such a recasting necessary. Accordingly we discard the term 'Secondary Predicate' and we adopt instead a more appropriate title, 'Oblique Predicate', by which all that is meant

is that the predication is expressed by another case than the nominative, or *casus rectus*.

We may now briefly sum up the results of what has been stated. The Greek Article is essentially demonstrative in its origin. It is twofold in its character, particular and generic, both are employed for the most part in Homer. The former becomes restricted in prose. We have amplified Donaldson's definition of the defining nature of the Article in Attic. The rhetorical significance of the Article was dwelt upon, viz., that thereby one was enabled to distinguish the subject from the predicate. This distinction was found to extend to the oblique cases of the noun. The attributive and predicative positions relatively to the Article were treated at some length. In connection with the predicative position, we referred to the circumstance that predicative signification may be absent. Finally

we discussed the appropriateness of the term "Tertiary Predicate" and rejected it on the ground that there was nothing in it. "Oblique Predicate" was considered the most appropriate name.

In the chapters which follow the writer will endeavor to present as lucidly as possible, the results of his study of certain phases of oblique predication in classic and post-classic Greek. Naturally account is not taken of those cases where the predicative position fails to carry with it a predicative signification. The study includes the participle as well as the adjective, for the one is used with as much variety of usage as the other.

Before treating, however, of our subject proper we shall note to what extent the Attic orators make use of oblique predication. Differing as many of them do from one another,

we shall thus the better appreciate the stylistic effect of the construction.

The phases of oblique predication, which have been made the subject of special research, are two in number, and have been denominated "Adverbial Dative type of predication" and "Prepositional type of predication". The former of these refers to dative expressions in which the adjective or participle holds the predicative position relatively to the Article; the latter takes account of phrases containing a predicative adjective or participle introduced by a preposition. In connection with the former of these types, an effort is made to show the genesis of the dative construction.

Oblique Predication in the Attic Orators

Oblique Predication in the Attic Orators.

The first noticed reference to this subject which has come under my observation appears in a dissertation written by S. Elias(1). On p. 17 he has something to say of the predicative use of the adjective in connection with an oblique case of the substantive. He observes that the construction is found in all the Orators, but that it is used oftener by some than by others. It is found 2 times in Andocides – the fourth oration is included – 9 times in Antiphon, 2 times in Hyperides, 4 times in Dinarchus. For the rest of the Orators he contents himself with general statements. He remarks that it occurs often in Demosthenes, oftenest in Isocrates, whose example is followed by Lycurgus.

The next reference to the same subject which the writer has noticed is made by H. Mayer(2). On p. [illegible] Mayer notes the marked fondness of Lycurgus for the predicative position, as it is called, of the adjective. "Si enim, quemadmodum oratio sit structa, quaerimus, videbimus in praedicativa quae dicitur collocatione adhibenda quasi

---

(1) Quaestiones Lycurgeae. Halis Saxonum, 1870.

(2) Observationes in Lycurgi Oratoris usum dicendi, [illegible] [illegible].

auxiliari interiecimus". He cites a number of examples from Lycurgus and gives the figures for other orators given by Elias in the dissertation already referred to. Grein added a note on the stylistic effect of the construction: "ubi in tali adiectivorum collocatione plus ponderis subesse sententiae manifestum est".

It is quite evident from the figures given by Elias that he has examined somewhat carefully the usage of each of the orators. Some allowance must be made for difference of opinion as to what properly constitutes a true predication. His statement in regard to Demosthenes, Isocrates, and Lycurgus is correct as far as it goes, if one has regard merely to the number of occurrences; but looked at properly, i.e., in relation to the bulk of work which each orator represents, his statement is far from correct.

A table of the usage of the orators is subjoined. The number of predicative adjectives or participles is given for each orator. Only

[illegible] portions which are generally considered genuine have been included. In the case of [illegible], we have followed Blass[1].

Range of Oblique Predication

Orator	No. of Pred. Adj. and Ppl.	No. of Teubner pages	Percentage (per Teub. page)
Lycurgus	25	45	.55
Isocrates	139	482	.29
Dinarchus	12	54	.22
Lysias	18	200	.09
Hyperides	4	44	.09
Aeschines	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Antiphon	8	99	.08
Isaeus	12	138	.08
Demosthenes	64	768	.08
Andocides	3	67	.04
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

([illegible])

---

[1] [illegible]

without attempting to force in any respect the significance of these figures, or desiring to claim for them absolute accuracy, the writer thinks he may justly make the following statements on the basis of them.

(1) Three of the Orators stand out from the rest in the use they make of oblique predication. They are Lycurgus, Isocrates and Dinarchus. At the opposite pole to Lycurgus, stands Andocides.

(2) The rest of the Orators show a marked resemblance to one another in the extent to which they make use of this construction.

(3) Most striking is the large use in the Epitaphios of Pseudo-Lysias.

What are the legitimate conclusions which one may draw from these facts?

It is epideictic oratory which shows a marked partiality for this construction. The epideictic orator aims to be solemn and impressive. Hence

-tes, who is purely an epideictic orator, was the first to use it with considerable freedom. Lycurgus, who was an apt pupil, has outdone his master in this respect. The Epitaphios, which is regarded by many scholars as the work of some sophist, shows a highly excessive use. It is very unlike the style of Lysias[1]; he has shown us how he wrote in the epideictic manner.

The plain, simple style of Lysias and Hyperides would be inclined to avoid many of the forms of oblique predication as being too artificial. Andocides, who may be considered the type of the natural orator, made a moderate use of this construction. [illegible] [illegible] imitator, he seems to avoid some of the less usual forms.

Demosthenes, the trained orator, like Aeschines, used the construction in moderation. His usage is various. A partiality for the prepositional type is noticeable.

---

[1] Cf. the Olympiacus of Lysias (or. xxxiii)

Andocides, who was not to any great extent influenced by the rhetorical schools, and who represents the language of polished conversation, uses the construction very seldom.

Antiphon, representative with Thucydides of the austere style, used moderately the types of oblique predication.

It is evident from these considerations that rhetorical effect was uppermost in the minds of those who employed these types of predication. Epideictic oratory proved to be the most congenial soil in which they could take root.

We have shown the range of oblique predication in the Attic Orators and have endeavored to regard it stylistically. Before proceeding to a special examination of the adverbial value in the two positional types of predication, we may at this point appropriately reduce the range of their usage in the Orators.

Adverbial-Dative Type.

Orator	No. of Pred. Adj. and Ppl's	No. of Teubner Pages	Percentage
Lycurgus	1	45	.022
Isocrates	6	482	.012
Aeschines	2	188	.01
Isaeus	1	138	.007
Demosthenes	2	768	.002
Pseudo-Ly. 'ns	1	17	.06
Lucian	76	1268	.06

A cursory examination of the above list reveals the fact that half of the Orators are not represented at all. The usage of Lucian — no attempt is here made to distinguish the genuine portions from the spurious writings not thought necessary — is here added to show the contrast between the usage of the Orators and that of the Atticist.

Prepositional Type.

Orator	No. of Pred. Adj. and Ppl's	No. of Teubner Pages	Percentage
Dinarchus	2	54	.037
Demosthenes	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Aeschines	4	188	.02
Isocrates	7	482	.014
Andocides	1	67	.015
Antiphon	1	99	.01
Lysias	1	200	.005
Pseudo-Lysias	1	17	.06
Lucian	94	1268	.074

Again we notice how limited the range of usage is on the part of the Orators. In marked contrast stands that of Lucian. Owing to the nature of the periodic, it was a favorite form of oblique predication with Demosthenes, especially in his public orations.

We should remark with reference to the statistics we have given of the Adverbial-Dative and Prepositional Types of Predication that we have not included under this particular head a class of participles which [illegible] [illegible]. Krüger [illegible] [illegible] of these [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] häufig [illegible] ein Substantiv, wie ein Substantiv [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] make but a small group in this [illegible]. Such are, e.g.,

Antiphon [illegible]: [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

Andocides III.27: [illegible]

Lysias IX.11: [illegible]

Isocrates 31: [illegible]

[illegible]

† Demosthenes XLVII.47: ἐκ τῆς [illegible]

---

(1) Griechische Sprachlehre, 56. 11, 3

The Origin of the Adverbial-Dative Type of Infinitive

Every investigator who has to study the Greek Dative is confronted with the special difficulty that he has not a single case but a blending of cases before him. Scholars have discovered that it is by no means a simple task to separate the component elements of the Dative case. It is not the writer's purpose to enter into this discussion. He would content himself with acknowledging his obligations to Delbrück(1) and the review of this work by Professor Gildersleeve(2), to Hübschmann(3), to Windisch(4), and proceed to the discussion of that part of the subject with which he is most immediately concerned.

The Greek Dative, as we have said, is a mixed or syncretistic case. It combines three cases which we find separate in a sister language, the Sanskrit. These are the *true Dative*, the *Instrumental* and the *Locative*. It is with the second of these three elements of the Dative that we are here concerned, the

---

(1) Die Grundlagen der Griechischen Syntax, 1879, p. 52 ff.
(2) Amer. Journ. of Philology, vol. II. p. 83 ff.
(3) Zur Casuslehre, Munich, 1875.

so-called Instrumental. Inasmuch as means is only a species of accompaniment, we might better call it the Sociative Dative or the Dative of Accompaniment. This idea is presented in a convincing manner by Professor Gildersleeve[1] who in speaking of the language of Homer, says: "There was no difference in conception between σὺν τεύχεσι and σὺν θεῷ. The distinction is purely modern. What we regard as subordinate, as mere appendage was not such to the primitive man. The man's weapons, horses, chariot were an extension of his individuality and the feeling is by no means dead, as is attested by the proper names given to arms, to castles, to vessels, and by the affectionate feminine pronoun so often employed in familiar English of utensils of all kinds."

The Sociative Dative begins very simply in Homer, and at the same time very naturally. The genesis of this Dative has, in the writer's judgment, been correctly set forth in an article which was recently published by R. Stög[2].

---

(1) Μετά and σύν in the Am. Journ. of Phil., vol. VIII, p. 218 ff.

(2) Der Attributive Gebrauch von Αὐτός beim sociativen Dativ, Wiener Studien,

Stolz seems to be ignorant of work done in connection with this subject by Dr. [illegible](1) [illegible] by way of illustration from Homer's Iliad:

Σ 506: τοῖσιν ἔπειτ' ἤισσον.

Here the context shows that τοῖσιν is equivalent to σκῆπτρα ἔχοντες.

Ρ 460: ἵπποις ἀίσσων.

[illegible] examples [illegible] by [illegible] and Stolz. The simple dative [illegible], accordingly, was sufficient to express accompaniment. And the sociative sense of the simple dative [illegible] in [illegible] post-Homeric [illegible](2) [illegible] with the notion of [illegible]:

Herodotus V. 99: οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπικέατο εἴκοσι νηυσί.

" VI. [illegible]: Λέσβιοι [illegible] νηυσί [illegible]
κοντο.

Thucydides VIII. [illegible]: οἱ ἐκ τῆς Λέσβου [illegible]
βεβηκότες ἐς τὴν Χίον τῇ στρατιᾷ.

Pseudo-Lysias II. 32: εἰδότες δ' ὅτι … ἐπιπλεύσαντες χιλίαις
ναυσὶν ἐρήμην τὴν πόλιν λήψονται.

Cf. R. Helbing(2) for [illegible] in Herodotus.

---

(1) Ueber den [illegible] instrumentalen Gebrauch des griechischen Dativs bei Homer, [illegible], 1855.

(2) Ueber den [illegible] lokativen und sociativen Dativ bei Herodot [illegible]

In our consideration of the sociative sense of the simple Dative, it will be appropriate that we should notice one of the most interesting and striking phenomena of Greek: the use of the Dative with αὐτός to express accompaniment. This idiom has been, and is, a puzzle to many. Monro[1] remarks that in such a phrase as

Hom. Odys. ξ 77: αὐτοῖς ὀβελοῖσι,

which he explains 'with the meat sticking to the spit as before', the sociative sense is emphasised by the addition of αὐτοῖς, and adds that without such an addition there would generally be nothing to decide between the different possible meanings of the Dative, and consequently a preposition (σύν or ἅμα) would be needed. To my mind there is only a partial truth in this view. The sociative sense lies in the simple Dative. That sociative sense is emphasised by the use of αὐτός. But if αὐτός is dropped, all that is lost is the emphasis which it imparted to the expression. This has been made sufficiently clear by [illegible]. A further cause for misconception has been the occasional use of the

---

[1] Homeric Grammar, p.135, note.

using with αὐτός in the same construction. This has led Krüger[1] and other scholars to the wrong conclusion that we have an ellipsis of σύν in those cases where it does not occur. Mommsen (l.c.) remarks that the mere proportion of occurrences, in Homer, of αὐτός with the Dative and of σύν followed by αὐτός with the Dative shows that the form without the preposition is the original one. The reason, he observes, why it is connected with the Dative is that it has assumed the functions of the Instrum. Comitative. Had he gone further and considered this as applicable to the Dative unaccompanied by αὐτός, he would have anticipated Stolz at this point.

The usage of αὐτός in this idiom for different authors is given by Mommsen[2]. It occurs in Homer 13 times, σύν being added in three instances. Mommsen's theory, which we cannot accept, is that αὐτός like σύν serves to raise the weak instrumental to a sociative. The use of αὐτός with the singular is

---

[1] Dialekte 48, 15, 16.

[2] Beiträge zu der Lehre von den Griech. Präpositionen, Berlin, 1895, p. 62.

peculiar to Comedy and Prose. The tragic use is confined to the plural and generally is concerned with things. In Aristophanes[1] it is used only of things, but in both singular and plural and with or without the article. The use of the article in this connection is confined to Comedy and Prose. Examples from Comedy are:

Aristophanes Vespae 170: αὐτοῖσι τοῖς κανθηλίοις.
" " [illegible] αὐτοῖς τοῖς [illegible].
" Equites 849: αὐτοῖς τοῖς πόρπαξι.
" Nubes, 1302: αὐτοῖς τροχοῖς τοῖς σοῖσι καὶ ξυνωρίσιν.

" Ranae, 560: αὐτοῖσι τοῖς ταλάροις.

Eupolis[2] Δῆμοι 37:
ταδὶ δὲ τὰ δένδρα Δαισπολίας καὶ Δαμασίας
αὐταῖσι ταῖς κνήμαισιν ἀκολουθοῦσί μοι.

In this last case the editors make themselves needlessly unhappy in their conjectures. A [illegible]

---

(1) Mommsen, Beiträge, p. 649
(2) Meineke, II.² p. 475 ff. – Kock, Frag. Com. Gr. vol. I. p. [illegible].

view is seconded by Henri Weil.(1) After noting the vagaries of Hermann, Bergk, and [illegible] with regard to the use of the Article, he pertinently asks whether it is necessary to change the reading at all, and makes the good suggestion that we have here a [illegible] for αὐταῖσι ταῖς ῥίζαισιν.

We may cite from Prose:

Herodotus VI. 32: καὶ τὰς πόλιας ἐνεπίμπρασαν αὐτοῖσι τοῖς ἱροῖσι.

[illegible] struck out the Article here and was followed by Krüger. In a number of passages from Herodotus the MSS vary as to the omission of the Article. Kallenberg,(2) after an examination of the passages in question, arrives at the conclusion that Herodotus was not uniform in his usage but sometimes admitted, sometimes omitted, the Article. It is clear that the Article was used because of the noun with which it is associated and not because of αὐτός. Simple as this statement may seem,

---

(1) Revue Critique, vol. 12 (N.S.), 1881, p. 293 ff.

(2) Commentatio critica in Herodotum. Berlin, 18[illegible] p. 15. Cf. also [illegible] p. 8.

the support of it has been lent by a number of great scholars. This principle has been ably emphasized recently in the course of an excellent contribution by the same scholar(1) on the Article with [illegible], ἐκεῖνος und ὅδε in Herodotus.

[illegible] as a following remark, seems to be a crystallized expression first used by Herodotus, then by Thucydides and Xenophon.

(Plato, Republic VII. 514 [illegible]; ξὺν [illegible].) No instance of [illegible] with the [illegible] Dative seems to occur in the Orators.(1) ([illegible])

Similar in form to these Datives with αὐτός, but differing from them in signification just as in the case of forms considered in the chapter on the Greek Article, are the Datives we shall now proceed to consider. In the case of [illegible], the position is predicative but predication is lacking. As we shall, in the next chapter, treat these Datives more in detail, we shall cite here

---

(1) [illegible] Berlin, [illegible] ff.

only a few characteristic examples.

[illegible] : [illegible] πατρί
Ἴωνες.

Thucydides 1, [illegible] : [illegible]

" 1, 6 ; ἀνειμένῃ τῇ διαίτῃ.

[illegible] : [illegible]

Isaeus VI.54 : μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ.

Aristophanes, Equites 280 ; κενῇ τῇ κοιλίᾳ.

Plato, Leges 830A : ψιλαῖς ταῖς χερσίν.

Phaedrus 243B : γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ.

Xenophon, Anabasis [illegible] : [illegible]

" " 1,8,6 : ψιλαῖς ταῖς κεφαλαῖς.

Hellenica 3,4,11 : φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ.

The Locative, rather than the instrumental force of such Datives as the foregoing is now recognized by Kühner-Gerth(1), as comparison with the preceding edition will readily show. "Attendant Circumstance" "Manner" and the like are simply special examples

---

(1) Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache, §425, 5.

tations of the same Dative.

We notice of course that these Datives differ in form from the Homeric in the use of the Article with the former. As has already been stated, the Article is infrequent in Hom..

The participle is employed generally with the Dat. sometimes in the present tense. Naturally [illegible] with peculiar sense. In the Orators the participle stands [illegible] in the ratio of 1:4, in Lucian, 1:6.

The most common and [illegible] of absolute [illegible] is the genitive absolute.(1) It is not unlikely that the Dative [illegible] as far as [illegible] is concerned is an extension of the genitive [illegible]. The point of view of the Greek dative is widely different.

---

(1) On its origin, Cf. Genitive Absolute in the Att. Orr., A.J.P. vol. VI, p. 312.

An entirely different view of these datives is that of Classen who, in the course of his remarks on the expression [illegible] τῇ νίκῃ in Thucydides VII. 77. 6, notes that we have here a "Dative Absolute," of which he has given several examples from Homer[1]. Compare, further, his notes on Thucydides I. 6. 3 and [illegible] which bear in the same direction. Monro[2] recognizes in a number of these examples from Homer an approach to a "Dative Absolute". They are, he says, extensions or free applications by the help of the participle of the true dative (Dat. eth.) Even granting that the Dative is used absolutely in Homer, which we do not believe, we claim that Classen is entirely wrong in placing this type in the same category. Classen's use of the term "Dative Absolute" has received merited strictures from Dr. Spieker[3]. The proper point of view from which to regard these datives is given by Kühner-Gerth, vol. I. § 425 8 & f and f. See also Wölfflin's Archiv, vol. VIII, p. [illegible] ff.

---

(1) Beobachtungen über den Hom. Sprg., p. 155.
(2) Homeric Grammar, p. 213.
(3) [illegible]

We may now sum up the results of our examination of the origin of the Adverbial Dative types of predication. The Dative, we saw, is not a single case, but a composite of three, the true Dative, the Instrumental so-called, and the Locative. We endeavored to show that Sociative was a more appropriate name for this case, and we saw that it was becoming current. Its beginnings are simple. In connection with this Dative, we considered the Homeric and later use of the Sociative Dative with [illegible]. We saw how it came to resemble by the [illegible] of the [illegible] the Datives we are specially interested in. The nature of the Greek Dative in the Adverbial-Dative types we proceed to treat in the next chapter. Finally we mentioned briefly the [illegible] theory of these Datives, and discarded it as untenable.

We shall now proceed to examine in more detail the classical and post-classical [illegible]

[We may briefly notice here a type of [illegible] [illegible]-tion with the participle [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. It differs from the type [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. We refer to the use of the predicate participle with ἅμα. Compare Krüger[1].

Again Mommsen[2] notes that Homer uses it in the [illegible] [illegible] of the break of day and of the setting of the sun.

ἅμ᾽ ἠοῖ φαινομένηφιν. Odys. δ 407, ξ 266, ο 396, etc., etc.
ἅμ᾽ ἠελίῳ ἀνιόντι. Odys. μ 429, ψ 362, Il. Σ 136
ἅμα δ᾽ ἠελίῳ καταδύντι. Odys. π 366, Il. Α 592, Σ 210

Mommsen, p. 177, notes the use of the first example in the Homeric hymns [illegible].

Herodotus does not confine himself to [illegible] [illegible], but uses ἅμα quite generally for "with". See the page 360.

Herodotus I, 8: ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένῳ.
" II, 44: ἅμα Τύρῳ οἰκιζομένῃ.
" III, 86: ἅμα τῷ ἵππῳ τοῦτο ποιήσαντι

Cf. Heine[3] considers these participles as appositive. But the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. Mommsen, p. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

---

[1] Griechische Sprachlehre 56, 9, 2.
[2] Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen, Berlin, 1895, s. 65.
[3] De Participiorum apud Herodotum usu, [illegible], 1883, p. [illegible]

same way as Xenophon does καί. 42 out of 53 examples are time-limitations.

Thucydides II. 2 : ἅμα ἦρι ἀρχομένῳ.
" II. 6 : ἅμα γὰρ τῇ ἐσόδῳ γιγνομένῃ.
" III. 1 : ἅμα τῷ σίτῳ ἀκμάζοντι.

[illegible] : ἅμα ταῖς [illegible]

For the usage of Plato, compare Mommsen, p. 385.

Plat. Symposium, [illegible] E : ἅμα τῷ [illegible] λόγων.
" Timaeus, 37 E : ἅμα ἐκείνῳ ξυνισταμένῳ.
" Parmenides, 15[illegible] A : ἅμα τῷ [illegible] γιγνομένῳ.

In Xenophon [illegible] expressions : Anabasis 7, 7, 39 : σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς εἰδόσι.
Cyropaed. 8, 7, 6 : σὺν τῷ χρόνῳ [illegible].

Cf. Mommsen, p. 364.

The usage of the Orators is very restricted. [illegible] expression by L. Lutz[1]. [illegible] of their speeches. 6 out of 16 cases are found in Antiphon [illegible] the other Attic.]

---

[1] Die Casus-Adverbien bei den Attischen Rednern, Würzburg, 1891, p. 53.

The Adverbial-Dative Type of Predication in Classical and Late Greek

The Adverbial-Dative Type of Predication.

In the preceding chapter we discussed the origin of the Adverbial-Dative type of religious predication. We propose to treat here the usage of the classical period, making the Historians (Herodotus and Thucydides) and the Orators the bases of our study. By way of contrast we will note the usage of late Greek, making Lucian the basis for this period and noting any points of difference which may appear in a comparison with the norm of classical usage. An important difference between Greek and English with reference to the Article must be borne in mind. It is this: the Greek used the Article in characterizing various objects with which he stood in some personal relation where we use the possessive case of the pronoun. The Article appears as Krüger[1] remarks, in a faintly demonstrative.

Classical Greek.

The great majority of the Datives which we shall consider may easily be grouped under one head, viz. the

---

[1] Sprachlehre, 50, 2, 3

Sociative Dative. This Dative may conveniently be divided as follows: (1) Dative of Military Accompaniment, (2) Dative of Attendant Circumstances, (3) Dative of Means and Instrument.

(1) Dative of Military Accompaniment:

Herodotus VI. 8,1: Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, πεπληρωμένῃσι τῇσι νηυσὶ παρῆσαν οἱ Ἴωνες.

Thucydides IV. 55,1: οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἰδόντες μὲν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὰ Κύθηρα ἔχοντας, προσδεχόμενοι δὲ καὶ ἐς τὴν γῆν σφῶν ἀποβάσεις τοιαύτας ποιήσεσθαι, ἁθρόᾳ μὲν οὐδαμοῦ τῇ δυνάμει ἀντετάξαντο.

" VI. 34,5: εἰ δ' αὖ τῷ ταχυναυτοῦντι ἁθροωτέρῳ κουφίσαντες προσβάλοιεν.

" VI. 37,1: μέγα γὰρ τὸ καὶ αὐταῖς ταῖς ναυσὶ κούφαις τοσοῦτον πλοῦν δεῦρο κομισθῆναι,

" VI. 43,1: (μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοσῇδε ἤδη τῇ παρασκευῇ Ἀθηναῖοι ἄραντες ἐκ τῆς Κερκύρας)

Thucydides II. [illegible]: [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

το, ἀπορήσαντες etc.

" VIII. 104, 5: τῷ δὲ μέσῳ, τοιούτου ξυμβαίνοντος, ἀσθενέσι καὶ διεσπασμέναις ταῖς ναυσὶ καθέσταντο.

This exhausts the list of Datives of Military Accompaniment of the type under consideration. With one exception they are nautical expressions. No examples have been found in the [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] tiv,"[1] but we have observed only the instance cited [illegible] which the predicative position is [illegible].

Similar Datives [illegible] may be [illegible], e.g.,

[illegible]

" " [illegible]: ὀρθοῖσι τοῖς λόγοις.

[illegible]

---

[1] [illegible], Ueber den Gebrauch des echten und sociativen Dativs bei Herodot, p. [illegible]. [illegible] fails to notice the examples we have cited.

(2) Dative of Attendant Circumstances:-

Thucydides I, 6, 3: ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τόν τε σίδηρον κατέθεντο καὶ ἀνειμένῃ τῇ διαίτῃ ἐς τὸ τρυφερώτερον μετέστησαν.

.. I, 120, 5: ἐνθυμεῖται γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὁμοίᾳ τῇ πίστει καὶ ἔργῳ ἐπεξέρχεται, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ἀσφαλείας μὲν δοξάζομεν, μετὰ δέους δὲ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ ἐλλείπομεν.

.. II. 38, 2: ἐπεσέρχεται δὲ διὰ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως ἐκ πάσης γῆς τὰ πάντα, καὶ ξυμβαίνει ἡμῖν μηδὲν οἰκειοτέρᾳ τῇ ἀπολαύσει τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὰ γιγνόμενα καρποῦσθαι ἢ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων.

.. II. 100, 2: ἀλλὰ ὕστερον Ἀρχέλαος ὁ Περδίκκου υἱὸς βασιλεὺς γενόμενος τὰ νῦν ὄντα ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ᾠκοδόμησε καὶ ὁδοὺς εὐθείας ἔτεμε καὶ τἆλλα διεκόσμησε τά τε κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἵπποις καὶ ὅπλοις καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ παρασκευῇ κρείσσονι ἢ ξύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι βασιλῆς ὀκτὼ οἱ πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενόμενοι

Thucydides III. 38, 1: ὁ γὰρ παθὼν τῷ δράσαντι ἀμβλυτέρᾳ τῇ ὀργῇ ἐπεξέρχεται, ἀμύνασθαι δὲ τῷ παθεῖν ὅτι ἐγγυτάτω κείμενον ἀντίπαλον ὂν μάλιστα τὴν τιμωρίαν ἀναλαμβάνει.

" VI. 55, 3: ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὸ πρότερον ξύνηθες τοῖς μὲν πολίταις φοβερόν, ἐς δὲ τοὺς ἐπικούρους ἀκριβές, πολλῷ τῷ περιόντι τοῦ ἀσφαλοῦς κατεκράτησε,

A few remarks on the foregoing. Editors see in the first example [illegible] equivalent for the genitive absolute construction. The point of view which the historian presents forbids such a comparison. We have already referred to Stahl's note on this construction. In the second example the reading [illegible] which is adopted by some editors, gives clearly an example of the construction under consideration and the editors are warranted in making the slight change. In the last example we have a favorite Thucydidean use of the neuter participle. It is equivalent to πολλῇ τῇ περιουσίᾳ.

(1) See [illegible] Abs. in the Attic Orators, A. J. P. [illegible]

We now turn to a different department, that of the Orators.

Pseudo-Lysias II. 18: πρῶτοι δὲ καὶ μόνοι ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκβαλόντες τὰς παρὰ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς δυναστείας δημοκρατίαν κατεστήσαντο, ἡγούμενοι τὴν πάντων ἐλευθερίαν ὁμόνοιαν εἶναι μεγίστην, κοινὰς δ᾽ ἀλλήλοις τὰς ἐκ τῶν κινδύνων ἐλπίδας ποιήσαντες ἐλευθέραις ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐπολιτεύοντο.

Isocrates, XV. 126: τοιγάρτοι διὰ τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐκ τούτων γιγνομένην πολλαὶ τῶν πόλεων τῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς δυσκόλως ἐχουσῶν ἀναπεπταμέναις αὐτὸν ἐδέχοντο ταῖς πύλαις.

Isaeus, VI. 59: καὶ διαρρήδην μαρτυρίας [illegible] τοὺς παῖδας εἶναι οἴεται ἐξαρκέσειν ὑμῖν τὰς ἐκβάσεις, ἐὰν δὲ τοῦτο μὲν μηδ᾽ ἐγχειρήσῃ ἐπιδεικνύναι ἢ καὶ κατὰ μικρόν τι ἐπιμνησθῇ, ἡμῖν δὲ λοιδορήσηται μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ καὶ λέγῃ ὡς εἰσὶν οὗτοι μὲν πλούσιοι αὐτὸς δὲ πένης, διὰ δὲ ταῦτα δόξειν τοὺς παῖδας εἶναι γνησίους.

Lycurgus, 145: οὐ γὰρ μόνον νῦν οἱ φεύγοντες κατέρχονται, [illegible] τὴν πόλιν, [illegible] φυγὴν αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ καταγνοὺς καὶ οἰκήσας ἐν Μεγάροις ἐπὶ προστάτου πλείω πέντ' ἢ ἓξ ἔτη ἔν τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀναστρέφηται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ μηλόβοτον τὴν Ἀττικὴν εἶναι φανερᾷ τῇ ψήφῳ καταψηφισάμενος, οὗτος ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ σύνοικος ὑμῶν γενήσεται.

[illegible] XXI, [illegible]: καὶ τοιαῦτα [illegible] [εἰργασμένα], ὁ ἀκάθαρτος οὗτος τολμήσει βλέπειν εἰς ὑμᾶς, καὶ τὸν βεβιωμένον αὐτῷ βίον αὐτίκα δὴ μάλ' ἐρεῖ λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ·

.. LVII, 11: ἐπειδὴ δ' ἐκλήθη τοὔνομα, ἀναστὰς οὗτος ἐβλασφήμει κατ' ἐμοῦ ταχὺ καὶ πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ, μάρτυρα μὲν ὧν κατηγόρησεν οὐδένα παρασχόμενος οὔτε τῶν δημοτῶν οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν, παρεκελεύετο δὲ τοῖς δημόταις ἀποψηφίζεσθαι.

Demosthenes XLIII. 52 : καὶ ὅτε εἰσήγετο, οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι φράτερες κρύβδην ἔφερον τὴν ψῆφον, οὑτοσὶ δὲ Μακάρτατος φανερᾷ τῇ ψήφῳ ἐψηφίσατο ὀρθῶς εἰσάγεσθαι Εὐβουλίδῃ υἱὸν τὸν παῖδα τουτονί

Aeschines I. 19 : ἄν τις Ἀθηναίων φησίν, ἑταιρήσῃ, μὴ ἐξέστω αὐτῷ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων γενέσθαι, ὅτι οἶμαι στεφανηφόρος ἡ ἀρχή, μηδ' ἱερωσύνην ἱεράσασθαι, ὃς οὐδὲ καθαρῷ διαλέγεται τῷ σώματι, μηδὲ συνδικῆσαι, φησί, τῷ δημοσίῳ·

" II. 7 : περὶ δὲ τῆς ἄλλης κατηγορίας δέομαι ὑμῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἐάν τι παραλίπω καὶ μὴ μνησθῶ, ἐπερωτᾶν με καὶ δηλοῦν, ὅτι ἂν ποθῆτε ἀκοῦσαι, μηδὲν προκατεγνωκότας, ὡς ἀδικῶ, ἀλλ' ἴσῃ τῇ εὐνοίᾳ ἀκούοντας.

The first of these examples forms the close of a highly rhetorical sentence.

In the second we note the position of ἀναπεπταμένας. Had it been placed before τὰς πύλας after

ἐδέχοντο, we should have had hiatus which Isocrates studiously avoided.

The next example from Isaeus, μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ, we may compare with the same expression from Demosthenes and a similar one λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ. φωνῇ it may be remarked is the only word used in this construction by Isaeus or Demosthenes.

The example cited from Lycurgus φανερᾷ τῇ ψήφῳ, appears in a highly rhetorical passage, reminding one of ἐλευθέρᾳ τῇ ψυχῇ in pseudo-Lysias. We again meet with this form in pseudo-Demosthenes [illegible]. Von Blass revises [illegible] text by striking out the Article. He has of course MS. warrant [illegible] the reason he gives "At metaphorice hic usurpatur ψῆφος" carries no weight.

The first example from Aeschines κοινῇ τῇ [illegible] calls for no special comment. In [illegible] there is a [illegible]. [illegible]

The second example from Aeschines ἴσῃ τῇ εὐνοίᾳ, reminds

[illegible] ὁμοίᾳ τῇ πίστει [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible] ΣΠ [illegible]

ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί καὶ ἱκετεύω καὶ ἀντιβολῶ, λογισαμένους τό τε μέγεθος τοῦ παρόντος ἀγῶνος, καὶ τὴν αἰσχύνην μεθ' ἧς ὑπάρχει τοῖς ἁλισκομένοις ἀπολωλέναι, ἀκοῦσαι καὶ ἐμοῦ σιωπῇ, μάλιστα μέν, εἰ δυνατόν, μετὰ πλείονος εὐνοίας τῇ τούτου (τοῖς γὰρ ἐν κινδύνῳ καθεστηκόσιν εἰκὸς εὐνοϊκωτέρους ὑπάρχειν), εἰ δὲ μή, μετὰ τῆς ἴσης.

[illegible] illustrated in the two examples from [illegible] and Demosthenes, ἴσῃ τῇ εὐνοίᾳ and μετὰ τῆς γ' ἴσης (sc. εὐνοίας). "With equal favor" is our common expression.

Note the character of the substantives in the illustrations taken from the Orators. They are such words as χείρ, φωνή, ψόφος, σῶμα, εὔνοια. This list is important for this reason, that it gives us the key to the true home of the construction which we are studying. Further verification of our statement will be found in the pages which follow. *The construction concerns the body and its parts.* Analogy of course operates here.

The Article in each of these examples may be regarded, as has already been noted, as a *weakened possessive*. Our English idiom, however, requires us to omit the possessive in a large number of cases. For instance, we should not say 'with his voice loud' but 'with a loud voice'. But we do say – and this helps us to understand the idiom – 'with his eyes open', 'with his hands clasped', 'with his face burnt', etc.

We will now note, incidentally, examples from other authors:

Aristophanes Equites [illegible]: [illegible]
" [illegible]: [illegible]

Plato Leges [illegible] A: [illegible]
" Politicus [illegible]: [illegible]
" Phaedrus 243B: γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ.
† Anterastae [illegible]: μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ (μέγα λέγων)

It is noteworthy that Plato seems to have avoided the expression μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ. Instead of it he uses in Protagoras 310B: τῇ φωνῇ μέγα λέγων

Xenophon, Anabasis, 1,8,1: ἱδροῦντι τῷ ἵππῳ cf. Hell. 4,5,7.
" " 1,8,6: ψιλῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ
(Most editions read, however ψιλὴν ἔχων τὴν κεφαλήν)
" " 7,2,6: ἐγκεχαλινωμένοις τοῖς ἵπποις
Hellenica 2,1,4: μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ
" 3,4,11: μάλα φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ

(3) [illegible] :—

Thucydides II. 49,5: καὶ πολλοὶ τοῦτο τῶν ἠμελημένων ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἔδρασαν ἐς φρέατα, τῇ δίψῃ ἀπαύστῳ ξυνεχόμενοι.

" II. 76,4: ὁπότε προσπεσεῖσθαί πῃ μέλλοι ἡ μηχανή, ἀφίεσαν τὴν δοκὸν χαλαραῖς ταῖς ἁλύσεσι [illegible].

" VII. 36,3: ἀντίπρῳροι γὰρ ταῖς ἐμβολαῖς χρώμενοι ἀναρρήξειν τὰ πρῴραθεν αὐτοῖς, στερίφοις καὶ παχέσι, πρὸς κοῖλα καὶ ἀσθενῆ παρέχοντες, τοῖς ἐμβόλοις.

As the most important word in the first example is ἀπαύστῳ, the effect is well brought out by making it predicative.

Emphasis also in the adjective of the second, viz. χαλαραῖς, thus becoming predicative.

στερίφοις καὶ παχέσι τοῖς ἐμβόλοις are predicative, but regarded as instrumental with ἀναρρήξειν. "With the short and solid beaks, which they used [illegible]

ones of the Athenians." παίοντες is read by some for παρέχοντες.

Turning to the Orators, we pick out a few instances, as of [illegible] these in Isocrates.

Isocrates X. 23: οὐ γὰρ μόνον τοῖς ὅπλοις ἐκοσμήσαντο παραπλησίοις ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἐχρήσαντο τοῖς αὐτοῖς, ὥσπερ χρὴ συγγενεῖς ποιοῦντας.

" XV. 47: καὶ γὰρ τῇ λέξει ποιητικωτέρᾳ καὶ ποικιλωτέρᾳ τὰς πράξεις δηλοῦσι, καὶ τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν ὀγκωδεστέροις καὶ καινοτέροις χρῆσθαι ζητοῦσιν, ἔτι δὲ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἰδέαις ἐπιφανεστέραις καὶ πλείοσιν ὅλον τὸν λόγον διοικοῦσιν.

In the first of these examples, it is evident that the position of παραπλησίοις is due to Isocrates' desire to avoid hiatus. We notice in the second a carefully studied and symmetrical arrangement of the different parts.

We have now examined the classical usage of the Sociative Dative, so far as the Historians and Orators are concerned, under the heads (1) Dative of Military Movements, (2) Dative of Attendant Circumstances, (3) Dative of Means and Instrument. This division is to a certain extent one of convenience, as the line cannot be sharply drawn.

A few more Datives involving the principle of oblique predication may be noticed here.

Thucydides II. 100, : ἐπὶ δὲ πλήθους περικληόμενοι αὐτοὺς πολλαπλασίῳ τῷ ὁμίλῳ ἐς κίνδυνον καθίστασαν

This Dative is considered by some as Dative of Cause. Others regard it as a Dative of the Indirect Object.

Thucydides I. 30 : .. ἐκράτουν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τοὺς τῶν Κορινθίων ξυμμάχους ἐπιπλέοντες ἔφθειρον μέχρι οὗ Κορίνθιοι περιιόντι τῷ θέρει πέμψαντες ναῦς καὶ στρατιάν

We have here the Dative of Time. Compare Xen. Hellen. 3, 2, 25: περιιόντι τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ. Jowett (Thuc. I, 30 note) claims the cases are not exactly parallel.

Thucydides I. 117, 1: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ οἱ Σάμιοι ἐξαπιναίως ἔκπλουν ποιησάμενοι, ἀφάρκτῳ τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἐπιπεσόντες.

" II. 89. 3: ἐμπειρίᾳ τε τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἡμῶν οὐδέν τι πλέονι ὑπερέχει.

" IV. 122, 5: οἱ δὲ δίκῃ μὲν οὐκ ἤθελον κινδυνεύειν, στρατεύειν δὲ ὡς τάχιστα, ὀργὴν ποιούμενοι εἰ καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ἤδη ὄντες ἀξιοῦσι σφῶν ἀφίστασθαι, τῇ κατὰ γῆν Λακεδαιμονίων ἰσχύϊ ἀνωφελεῖ πιστεύοντες.

" VII. 39, 2: ὅπως αὐτοῖς ἐκβιβάσαντες τοὺς ναύτας εὐθὺς παρὰ τὰς ναῦς ἄριστοποιήσονται, καὶ δι' ὀλίγου αὖθις καὶ αὐθημερὸν ἀπροσδοκήτοις τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐπιχειρῶσι.

These are Datives of the Indirect Object, with which the predicative adjective stands in agreement. They are not to be confounded with the Sociative Dative of which we have treated. It is not always easy to decide which kind of Dative we have, as in the following instances.

Thucydides [illegible]: [illegible]
ὡς οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι, ἐπειδὴ ἀθρόαις ταῖς ναυσὶν
οὐκ ἀξιόμαχοι νομίσαντες εἶναι οὐκ ἀντανήγοντο,

We have already quoted this example under the Dative of military Accompaniment, thereby showing our preference. If it refers to the Peloponnesians, we have the Dative of Accompaniment. "The Peloponnesians had not gone out because they thought that even with their united force they could not risk a battle". If the reference is to the Athenians, then we have the Indirect Object. "The Peloponnesians had not gone out because they thought that they were not a match for the now united forces of the enemy." ...

Jowett, whose translation we quote, prefers the former, Krüger, the latter.

[illegible] the following [illegible]:

Antiphon III. γ 6: ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ
καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδοτρίβου, ὃς
ὑποδέχοιτο τοῖς ἀκοντίζουσι τὰ ἀκόντια

(continued)

[ἀναιρεῖσθαι], διὰ τὴν τοῦ βαλόντος ἀκολασίαν πολεμίῳ τῷ τούτου βέλει περιπεσών.

Antiphon V. 12: ἔπειτα κελεύεις τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀνωμότους πιστεύσαντας τοῖς μαρτυροῦσι φόνου δίκην καταγνῶναι.

Lysias XXXII. 14: ἐν γὰρ τῇ μετοικίᾳ, ὅτ' ἐκ Κολλυτοῦ διῳκίζετο εἰς τὴν Φαίδρου οἰκίαν, τοὺς παῖδας ἐπιτυχόντας ἐκβεβλημένῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ ἐνεγκεῖν πρὸς αὐτήν.

Isocrates VIII. 101: καὶ ταῖς πράξεσι ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐπεχείρησαν καὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασι παραπλησίοις ἐχρήσαντο καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ὁμοίαις ταῖς συμφοραῖς περιέπεσον.

" XVIII, 20: Ἆρα μικρῷ τῷ δικαίῳ πιστεύων τὴν παραγραφὴν ἐποιησάμην, etc. (Omit)

Aeschines III. 146: μισθοφορῶν δ' ἐν τῇ ξενικῇ καὶ ταῖς χώραις, καὶ τὰ στρατιωτικὰ χρήματα κλέπτων, καὶ τοὺς μυρίους ξένους ἐκμισθώσας Ἀμφισσεῦσι πολλὰ διαμαρτυρομένου καὶ σχετλιάζοντος ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐμοῦ, προσέμιξε φέρων ἀναρπασθέντων τῶν ξένων τὸν κίνδυνον ἀπαρασκεύῳ τῇ πόλει.

All of these are Datives of the Indirect Object with which the predicative adjective or participle stands in agreement.

Late Greek

As we have already stated, Lucian has been made the basis of our study of this period. He is generally conceded to be the best of the Atticists, and his usage is very instructive for the period. We cannot fail to notice, in the Lucianic usage of the Adverbial Dative construction the salient fact to which attention has already been called that *it has, first and chiefly, to do with the body and its parts*. But if we look deeper than this general resemblance we shall see that while he observes the letter of the law he kills the spirit. It was used by the Attic in circumstances justifying its use. The Atticist frequently used it regardless of circumstances. This [illegible].

As to our classification of the Datives, we find

that two classes of the Instrumental Dative practically exhaust the list of occurrences. These are: (1) Dative of Attendant Circumstances (2) Dative of Means or Instrument. The Dative of Military Accompaniment naturally does not occur. The classification we make, it should be remarked, is to a certain extent arbitrary.

It has not been considered necessary to discriminate between the genuine and the spurious dialogues of Lucian.

(1) Dative of Attendant Circumstances:—

Lucian. Nigrinus 2: ἐπαινῶν καὶ ἐπισημαίνων τῇ χειρὶ
ἐξαιρέτως, etc.

" Timon 9: καὶ λήρους μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ
ξυνειρόντων, Cf. Piscator 26, Cataplus 11, De merc. Cond. 24, and often.

" " 41: ἀναπεπταμένοις τοῖς κόλποις

" Dial. Deor. 20,6: τῷ τραχήλῳ ἀνακεκλιμένῳ

" Dial. Mer. 4,5: ἀνεῳγμένοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς

" " Mort. 21,1: ἀτρέπτῳ τῷ προσώπῳ (προσιέναι)

Lucian, Menippus 4: [illegible] τῇ φωνῇ
κραυγήν)
" " 18: μάλα τραχείᾳ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ τῇ φωνῇ
Bis Accus. 34: [illegible] τραχείᾳ τῇ φωνῇ [illegible]
" De merc. cond. 3: μεγάλῃ καὶ τραχείᾳ τῇ φωνῇ
" De Merc. Con. 34: [illegible] λεπτῇ τῇ φωνῇ
" Hermotimus 1: μακρῷ τῷ χρόνῳ [illegible]
" Zeuxis 4: ὑπεσταλμένῃ τῇ ὁπλῇ
" Quom. hist. conscr. 1: λιπαρεῖ τῷ πυρετῷ (ἐπιμόνῳ)
" " 45: ἐφ' ἵππου ὀχουμένῃ τότε τῇ γνώμῃ
τὴν ἑρμηνείαν πεζῇ συμπαραθεῖν
" Encomium 11: ψυχρῷ τῷ ἱδρῶτι ([illegible])
" Amores 13: λιπαροῖς τοῖς χείλεσιν ([illegible])
" " 36: ὑπεσταλμένῳ τῷ τῆς φωνῆς τόνῳ
" " 37: γυμνῷ τῷ λόγῳ ([illegible])
" " 52: ἱλαρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ (φαιδρός)
" Lucius 47: ἐπανθούσῃ τῇ τριχὶ [illegible]
" Gallus 6: ([illegible]) ἀνεῳγόσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
" Bis Accus. 10: ψιλῷ τιμήσαντες τῷ κρότῳ
De Parasito 49: μάλα φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ Cf. Conv. 11.

Lucian Philopseudes 24: μέλανες καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ λάσιοι
πιναρᾷ καὶ αὐχμώσῃ τῇ λάχνῃ

„ Cal. non tem. cred. 24 (ὑποκρινόμενον) ἱλαρῷ καὶ κωμικῷ
τῷ προσώπῳ

„ Navigium 16: πολλῷ τῷ γέλωτι (ἐπικλύσας τὸ
πλοῖον)

„ Dial. Meretr. 4, 5: (λέγουσα) ἐπιτρόχῳ τῇ γλώττῃ

„ [illegible] 35: [illegible]

„ „ 39: ἀνθρωπίνῃ μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ (λέγων)

„ Fugitivi 1[illegible]: ἐντείνασα [illegible]

„ „ 33: ῥυπώσῃ προσέτι καὶ γυναικείᾳ
τῇ πίττῃ.

He would indeed be blind who could fail to be struck by the character of the substantives in the foregoing list. With a very few exceptions, they are such as we have already described. Very noticeable is the frequent occurrence of μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ. We have already noted it in Dion and [illegible]. He adds

to the adjective μεγάλῃ, Demosthenes uses once λαμπρᾷ. What a contrast in this respect is presented by Lucian! He seems to ring all the changes which the construction allows. This is quite suggestive of his method of using an expression that strikes him. Such is the case with φαιδρῷ which Xenophon uses in the form φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ.

ἀναπεπταμένοις τοῖς κόλποις reminds one of the Isocratean ἀναπεπταμέναις .. ταῖς πύλαις.

(12) Dative of Means and Instrument:-

Lucian, Timon 21: παλαιᾷ τῇ ὁδῷ ([illegible])
" Dial. Mort. 17,1: (ἀρυσάμενος) κοίλῃ τῇ χειρί
" " 10,12: ἀφθόνοις τοῖς λίθοις Cf. Luc. 1.
" Zeuxis 3: ἀκριβεῖ τῇ στάθμῃ Cf. Imag. 17.
" Quom. Hist. Conscr. 7: οὐ στενῷ τῷ ἰσθμῷ διώρισται.
" " 34: πολλῇ τῇ ἀσκήσει καὶ συνεχεῖ τῷ πόνῳ καὶ ζήλῳ
" Vera Historia 1,6: οὐ τραχεῖ περιηχουμένην τῷ κύματι

Lucian, Phalaris Prior 11 : ἀλήκτοις ταῖς ὀδύναις ἐχόμενος
Amores 12 : ταῖς κόμαις εὐθαλέσιν (κομῶντα)
„ Imagines 14 : εὐκαίρῳ τῇ ὤσει καὶ βίᾳ ([illegible])
Toxaris 21 : μεγάλῳ τῷ πνεύματι (ἐλαυνομένους)
„ „ 61 : καμπύλῳ τῷ ξίφει (ὑποτμηθείς)
Lucius 42 : (παίουσιν) ἀθρόᾳ τῇ χειρί
„ 51 : πολλοῖς τοῖς φιλήμασι (προκαλουμένη)
„ Bis Accus. 11 : ἀγκύλῳ τῷ δακτύλῳ (ἀποξυόμενοι)
Anacharsis 31 : (κατατεμνόμενοι) βαθέσι τοῖς τραύμασιν
„ De Domo 18 : ἀθρόῳ τῷ κάλλει (περιχυθείς)
De Dipsadibus 1 : πολλῷ τῷ αὐχμῷ (πιεζομένη)
„ Dial. Meretr. 13,2 : ἐπιχρύσοις τοῖς ὅπλοις (ἀποστίλβοντα)
„ Convivium 44 : χρηστῷ μάλα καὶ βαθεῖ τῷ τραύματι
44 : ὀρθῷ τῷ δακτύλῳ
Nero 9 : (παίοντες) ὀρθαῖς ταῖς ὁπλαῖς

A few words as to this list. We notice that πολύς is frequently used in the predicate position. This is very common in Lucian. With πολύς, so far as the sense is concerned, may be compared ἄφθονος and ἀθρόος above.

Prepositional Type
of Predication
in Classical Greek

The Prepositional Type of Predication

By the term Prepositional Type of Predication is meant oblique predication introduced by a preposition. As in the case of the Adverbial-Predicate type, the writer purposes to examine the usage of [illegible] and [illegible], by way of comparison and contrast, that of each [illegible] period.

Classical Greek

Let us first note the usage of Herodotus.

The adjective is found but once in the [illegible] position, viz.,

Herodotus V. 92,7: μαρτύριον δέ οἱ εἶναι ὡς ἀληθέα ταῦτα λέγει, ὅτι ἐπὶ ψυχρὸν τὸν ἰπνὸν Περίανδρος τοὺς ἄρτους ἐπέβαλε.

To translate this, as some have done, "on the cold oven" or "in to a cold oven" is to utterly fail in giving the [illegible] construction. "When the oven was cold, Periander had put his loaves in it", correctly renders it.

The participle likewise occurs but once in the predicative position.

Herodotus, 5, 29: [illegible] πᾶσαν τὴν Μιλησίην, ὅκως τινὶ ἴδοιεν ἐν ἀνεστηκυίῃ τῇ χώρῃ ἀγρὸν εὖ ἐξεργασμένον, ἀπεγράφετο τὸ οὔνομα τοῦ δεσπότεω τοῦ ἀγροῦ.

Here only have the oblique predicate ἀνεστηκυίῃ. Oblique predication with the participle is quite familiar to us in the genitive absolute, which seems to have been the original form of oblique predication.

Krüger renders it "hoch gelegen". [illegible] which [illegible] "in the desolation of the land" ἀνεστηκυίῃ being explained by ἀναστάτῳ γινομένῃ, or ἀναστάτῳ ἐούσῃ.

Stein compares for the order of the words Xenophon, Cyropaedia, 1, 3: χαλεπὸν εἶναι καὶ τρέφειν ἵππους καὶ ἱππεύειν ἐν ὀρεινῇ οὔσῃ τῇ χώρᾳ.

We can readily see that this type of [illegible] which known to Herodotus, was of such a nature as not to harmonize with his style. It is quite the opposite in the case of his great rival Thucydides, who aimed to write in a style far above the conversational, with compactness of thought and precision of speech.

Of adjectives occupying the predicate position, a note.

Thucydides, I. 142: καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς ἐς τόνδε τὸν πόλεμον ἡ ἰδία παρασκευὴ μείζων ᾗ ὡς τὰ κράτιστά ποτε μετὰ ἀκραιφνοῦς τῆς ξυμμαχίας ἤνθησαν.

Classen notes that ἀκραιφνοῦς has the force of a [illegible] limitation. [illegible] would analyze it as = μετὰ τῆς ξυμμαχίας ἀκραιφνοῦς ἔτι οὔσης.

Thucydides III. 43,4: ἄλλως τε καὶ ὑπεύθυνον τὴν παραίνεσιν ἔχοντας πρὸς ἀνεύθυνον τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀκρόασιν.

This is a good example of Thucydides' preference of abstract to concrete expressions.

Thucydides VI. 77,1: ἀλλὰ Δωριῆς ἐλεύθεροι ἀπ' αὐτονόμου τῆς Πελοποννήσου τὴν Σικελίαν οἰκοῦντες.

" VI. 92,5: καὶ αὐτοὺς νῦν νομίσαντας περὶ μεγίστων δὴ τῶν διαφερόντων βουλεύεσθαι μὴ ἀποκνεῖν τὴν ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν τε καὶ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν στρατείαν etc.

" VII. 66,1: ὅτι μὲν καλὰ τὰ προειργασμένα καὶ ὑπὲρ καλῶν τῶν μελλόντων ὁ ἀγὼν ἔσται, ὦ Συρακόσιοι καὶ ξύμμαχοι, οἵ τε πολλοὶ δοκεῖτε ἡμῖν εἰδέναι·

Krüger analyses the last example thus: καλά ἐστι τὰ μέλλοντα ὑπὲρ ὧν.

As we can see, compactness of thought would be lost by such a resolution.

Thucydides VII. 84,4: ἐς τὰ ἐπὶ θάτερά τε τοῦ ποταμοῦ παραστάντες οἱ Συρακόσιοι, ἦν δὲ κρημνώδες, ἔβαλλον ἄνωθεν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, πίνοντάς τε τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀσμένους καὶ ἐν κοίλῳ ὄντι τῷ ποταμῷ ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ταρασσομένους.

Thucydides, VIII. 38,3: οἱ δὲ Χῖοι ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς πρὶν μάχαις πεπληγμένοι, καὶ ἄλλως ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς οὐ πάνυ εὖ διακείμενοι, etc.

The participle [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] this type as follows:-

Thucydides I. 36,1: καὶ ὅτῳ τάδε ξυμφέροντα μὲν δοκεῖ λέγεσθαι, φοβεῖται δὲ μὴ δι' αὐτὰ πειθόμενος τὰς σπονδὰς λύσῃ, γνώτω τὸ μὲν δεδιὸς αὐτοῦ ἰσχὺν ἔχον τοὺς ἐναντίους μᾶλλον φοβῆσον· τὸ δὲ θαρσοῦν μὴ δεξαμένου ἀσθενὲς ὂν πρὸς ἰσχύοντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἀδεέστερον ἐσόμενον, etc.

" I. 74,3: ὑμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀπό τε οἰκουμένων τῶν πόλεων καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ τὸ λοιπὸν νέμεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ ἐδείσατε ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ οὐχ ἡμῶν τὸ πλέον, ἐβοηθήσατε· ... ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀπό τε [illegible]

[illegible] in the latter examples the s[illegible] the [illegible] to the part which follow.

Thucydides I. 84.4: ἀεὶ δὲ ὡς πρὸς εὖ βουλευομένους τοὺς ἐναντίους ἔργῳ παρασκευαζώμεθα:

Jowett renders it: "Let us assume that our enemies have common prudence, and let our preparations be, not words, but deeds."

[illegible](1) says this expression is abridged for πρὸς τοὺς ἐναντίους ὡς πρὸς εὖ βουλευομένους, and cites as parallel expressions:

Thucydides IV. 41.2: καὶ οἱ ἐκ Ναυπάκτου Μεσσήνιοι ὡς ἐς πατρίδα ταύτην, ἔστι γὰρ ἡ Πύλος τῆς Μεσσηνίδος ποτὲ οὔσης γῆς, πέμψαντες σφῶν αὐτῶν τοὺς ἐπιτηδειοτάτους

(ὡς ἐς πατρίδα ταύτην = ἐς ταύτην ὡς ἐς πατρίδα)

Thucydides VI. 50.4: τοὺς ὄντας ἐν Συρακούσαις Λεοντίνων ὡς παρὰ φίλους καὶ εὐεργέτας Ἀθηναίους ἀδεῶς ἀπιέναι.

The writer is of the opinion that the method of ex-[illegible] and explaining such an expression as that given above is [illegible] one great [illegible]. [illegible]

---

(1) edition of Thucydides (1884), [illegible]

case is just the same as those we have been considering. βουλευομένους is a predicative participle in agreement with τοὺς ἐναντίους. Similar examples will be treated later.

We have surveyed the usage of the prepositional type of oblique predication in Herodotus and Thucydides, and have seen that there is a very decided difference between these two authors. Let us now examine the usage of the Orators, first with the adjective, secondly with the participle.

(1) Antiphon:-

Antiphon V. 33: ἕως μὲν οὖν μετὰ χρηστῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος ἐγίγνωσκέ μου καταψευδόμενος, τούτῳ διισχυρίζετο τῷ λόγῳ·

MS. N omits Art. MS. A reads Art. Some of the editors follow the one MS., some follow the other. [illegible][1] remarks that this is one of those expressions which the Greeks are wont to enrich with the Article where we are wont to do without it. He compares [illegible] 1,67: ἐν τίσι τὰς ἐλπίδας ἕξομεν; 1,77: ἐν τούτῳ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχειν; 1,102: ἐν τοῖς ἔξω τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχετε. Bienwald[2] holds that the reading with or

---

[1] De Crippsiano et Oxoniensi Antiphontis, Dinarchi, Lycurgi codicibus, Berlin, 1882 p. 70ff.

[2] De Crippsiano et Oxoniensi .. .. . Görlitz, 1887.

without the Article is correct, but, inasmuch as Antiphon more frequently makes use of the Article in the case of ἐλπίς, he would prefer to insert it.

M. Cucuel(1) notes, under "Adjectif attribut", that Antiphon quite often places an adjective "en relief" by detaching it from the substantive to which it belongs and makes it bear the force of the thought. In this way the phrase acquires more vigour and conciseness. He cites a happy instance of this conciseness of expression by comparing

Antiphon II. 21: οὐκ ἀληθὴς ἦν ἡ αἰτία ἣν αἰτιῶνται κατ' ἐμοῦ.

with " V. 38: οὐκ ἀληθῆ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπέφερον ἣν ᾐτιῶντο.

It seems to me that the Article should be retained, not because Antiphon uses it more often than he omits it in connection with ἐλπίς — for this has really little weight in settling the question — but because the Article is anaphoric, pointing back to § 31 τὴν μὲν ἐλευθερίαν ἐλπίσας οἴσεσθαι, and at the same time, as Cucuel observes, the expression

---

(1) Essai sur la Langue et le Style de l'Orateur Antiphon. Paris [illegible], p. 60.

gains in vigor thereby.

Compare, for the predicate position, Thucydides [illegible]: πολὺ δὲ χρὴ μετὰ τοῦδε καὶ [illegible] μεγάλην τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς νίκης ἔχειν. In late Greek we may cite Lucian Longaev. 9: ἔστι καὶ ὅπου χρηστὰς ἔχει τὰς ἐλπίδας; [illegible]: χρηστὰς εἶχον ἐπ' ἐμοὶ τὰς ἐλπίδας; [illegible]: [illegible] πονηρὰς εἶχε τὰς ἐλπίδας.

The participle does not occur, in this type of predicate, in Antiphon.

(2) Andocides:

The predicative adjective in this type does not occur.

Andocides I. 88: τὰς μὲν δίκας, ὦ ἄνδρες, καὶ τὰς διαίτας ἐποιήσατε κυρίας εἶναι, ὁπόσαι ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ τῇ πόλει ἐγίγνοντο.

Lipsius [illegible]. In this he follows Mr. A[illegible][1]. There is no good reason for omitting the article. Andocides is quoting from ὁπόσαι to ἐγίγνοντο the words of the law just read.

Hickie translates 'when it (i.e. the city) was under a democratical government'

Marchant .. 'in the time of the democracy'

---

[1] Edition of Andocides (1885)

We find the same expression in a law in Demosthenes XXIV. 56, and it is used by Demosthenes in XXIV. 76, where Kennedy misses the point by rendering 'in a democratic state'. Dobree[1] compares ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ τῇ πόλει of Dem. XXIV. 56 with δημοκρατουμένης τῆς πόλεως of Dem. XXIV. 48. This comparison seems apt, for in the former passage ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ τῇ πόλει and ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα are contrasted expressions, while in the latter passage we have δημοκρατουμένης τῆς πόλεως and ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα. In other words – with no intention of applying mathematics to language – ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ τῇ πόλει and δημοκρατουμένης τῆς πόλεως are practically equivalent expressions.

(3) Lysias:-

Lysias XII. 97: ὅσοι δὲ τὸν θάνατον διέφυγον, πολλαχοῦ
κινδυνεύσαντες καὶ εἰς πολλὰς πόλεις πλανηθέντες
καὶ πανταχόθεν ἐκκηρυττόμενοι, ἐνδεεῖς ὄντες τῶν
ἐπιτηδείων, οἱ μὲν ἐν πολεμίᾳ τῇ πατρίδι τοὺς παῖδας
καταλιπόντες, οἱ δ' ἐν ξένῃ γῇ, πολλῶν ἐναντιουμένων
ἤλθετε εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ.

---

[1] Adversaria Critica vol. I p. [illegible]

This is the only occurrence of this type in Lysias. It is at variance with the ordinary [illegible] Lysias, but in keeping with his [illegible] [illegible] at this point. The contrast with ἐν ξένῃ γῇ is forcibly brought out. The Article with πατρίδι is partly due to the fact that it is a substantivized adjective; it also has possessive force.

Pseudo Lysias π. 49: πολεμούντων δὲ Ἀθηναίων καὶ Αἴγυπτόν τε καὶ Αἴγιναν, καὶ τῆς ἡλικίας ἀπούσης ἔν τε ταῖς ναυσὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ πεζῷ στρατεύματι, Κορίνθιοι καὶ οἱ ἐκείνων σύμμαχοι, ἡγούμενοι ἢ εἰς ἔρημον τὴν χώραν ἐμβαλόντες ἢ ἐξ Αἰγίνης ἀπάξειν τὸ στρατόπεδον, ἐξελθόντες πανδημεὶ Γεράνειαν κατέλαβον.

We have already had occasion to speak of the Epitaphios so far as oblique predication is concerned.

For the predicative position with χώρα, we may also note Xen. Anab. 1, 3, 14: ὅστις ὡς διὰ φιλίας τῆς χώρας ἀπάξει, Cf. 2, 1, 8. Anab. 5, 4, 2: ἐρωτῶντας πότερον ὡς διὰ φιλίας ἢ [ὡς] διὰ πολεμίας πορεύσονται τῆς χώρας.

In late Greek we may cite Arrian, Indica, 3, 3: *δι' ἐρήμου*, οὐ μέντοι *δι' ἀνύδρου τῆς χώρας* (sc. ᾖει).

(4) Isocrates:—

Isocrates 1, 34: περὶ ὧν ἂν αἰσχύνῃ παρρησιάσασθαι,
βούλῃ δέ τισι τῶν φίλων ἀνακοινώσασθαι, χρῶ
τοῖς λόγοις ὡς *περὶ ἀλλοτρίου τοῦ πράγματος*.

Schneider emended τοῦ to του on the ground that τοῦ πράγματος does not agree with περὶ ὧν. He admitted, however, that the forms of the indefinite pronoun, του and τῳ, are used else where by Isocrates *without* [illegible]. [illegible] of Schneider's objection.

R. Bonitz[1] touching on Schneider's emendation refers to the weakness of the position admitted by Schneider himself, viz., that the gen. and dat. of the indef. pronoun are not connected in this way with a substantive by Isocrates himself. To Schneider's objection, he replies by denying that there is anything unusual in the [illegible] that the singular [illegible] must be referred to the plural [illegible]

---

[1] De Isocratis Demonicea, Stendal, 1884, p. 5.

compared with the entire phrase of pronouns is frequently substituted for one thing. That such a collocation is not at variance with Xenophon's usage, we may perhaps show by referring to 8,12: ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ τῇ πόλει. [illegible] retains the reading of the text.

The text, then, is correct as it stands. The writer, however, finds himself unable to accept the current conception of the construction. This is given by Schneider as the usual explanation which he would have accepted had it not been for the objection already mentioned. It is this:

ὡς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου τοῦ πράγματος = περὶ τοῦ πράγματος, ὡς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου, just as περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὡς [illegible] [illegible] is equivalent to περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὡς περὶ [illegible] [illegible]. He cites the rule that in comparisons, when the object compared is placed first the preposition is regularly omitted (cf. Krüger Gr. Sprachl. 68,9) as, e.g., in [illegible] 5,19: ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ (ἐν πόλει) τῇ πόλει κινδυνεύοντες; 8,56: ὥσπερ καὶ [illegible] τοῦ

(i.e. πρὸς τοῦτο) ἀναφέρων. Similarly Rauchenstein referring to Isocrates 8, 12: ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ τῇ πόλει says it is equivalent to ἐν τῇ πόλει ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ.

Reference has already been made in the case of Thuc. [illegible] ὥσπερ ἐς [illegible] [illegible] etc. to this method of conceiving the construction. Apart from the clumsiness of the explanation, so far as these particular examples are concerned, cases will appear later in which it will not suit. We have in these two examples from Isocrates (1, 34 and 8, 12) the use of the predicative adjective just as in the cases previously considered.

Freese renders the passage correctly (Isocrates 1, 34: καὶ τοῖς λόγοις ὡς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου [illegible]) "use language implying that the matter affects some other man".

Isocrates VIII, 12: ἐν ἡμῖν [illegible] [illegible]
ἂν ἀλλ' ἑτοίμως ἔχομεν, μηδὲν εἰς τοὺς [illegible]
αὐτοῖς πράττοντες, τριήρεις πληροῦν καὶ χρημάτων

εἴωθε δὲ [illegible] καὶ [illegible] καὶ [illegible]
οἷς ἂν τύχωμεν, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ τῇ πόλει
κινδυνεύοντες.

i.e. "as if we were only imperilling the interests of a foreign city". Ἀλλότριος in the Orators is usually attributive.

Isocrates XIV. 40: καὶ πάλαι ὑμεῖς τὴν ἀρχὴν
ἀφείλεσθε τὴν ἐκείνων, ἐξ ἀτειχίστου μὲν
τῆς πόλεως ὁρμηθέντες καὶ κακῶς πραττούσης τὸ δὲ δίκαιον ἔχοντες σύμμαχον;

We are reminded of Thucydides I, [illegible]: ἀτειχίστων τῶν πόλεων. In both cases the predicative word is salient.

A good instance is cited by Dr. Green[1] from Diodorus 13, 114, 1: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Γελῴους καὶ Καμαριναίους οἰκεῖν μὲν ἐν ἀτειχίστοις ταῖς πόλεσι, φόρον δὲ τελεῖν τοῖς Καρχηδονίοις.

Of participles predicatively used we note the following.

Isocrates VIII. 17: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνῃ χρώμενοι,

---

(1) Diodorus and the Peloponnesian War, Baltimore, 1899, p. 16.

πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ διαπραξάμενοι καὶ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκιμήσαντες, παρ' ἑκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔλαβον, etc.

Isocrates VIII. 30: καὶ γὰρ [illegible] τοιαύτης πολυπραγμοσύνης εἰς τοὺς ἐσχάτους κινδύνους κατέστημεν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δικαίαν τὴν πόλιν παρέχειν καὶ βοηθεῖν τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις καὶ μὴ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐπιθυμεῖν παρ' ἑκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐλάβομεν.

" Ep. VI. 9: .. πῶς χρὴ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον χρόνον ὑμῶν αὐτῶν προστῆναι καὶ τίνα βίον προελέσθαι καὶ ποίας δόξης ὀριγνηθῆναι καὶ ποτέρας τῶν τιμῶν ἀγαπῆσαι, τὰς παρ' ἑκόντων γιγνομένας ἢ τὰς παρ' ἀκόντων τῶν πολιτῶν·

[illegible]

Demosthenes XX. [illegible]: [illegible] κολακεύοντα λαμβάνειν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἰσηγορίᾳ δοκοῦντ' ἄξιόν τινος εἶναι τιμᾶσθαι τῶν καλῶν τινι, παρὰ τῶν ὁμοίων ἑκόντων θαυμάζεσθαι, τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ δεσπότου [illegible]

Demosthenes XXXVIII. 28: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ δύνωνται ταῦθ', ὡς οὐ δυνήσονται, ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν ἁπάντων δεόμεθα καὶ ἱκετεύομεν, μὴ ἐκδοῦναι ἡμᾶς τούτοις, μηδὲ τετάρτην οὐσίαν ἔτι δοῦναι τρεῖς ἑτέρας κακῶς διῳκηκόσιν, ἣν παρ' ἑκόντων ἔλαβον τῶν ἐπιτρόπων, ἣν ὑπὲρ τῶν δικῶν εἰσεπράξαντο, etc.

Aeschines III. 58: ὑμῖν γὰρ ἐξεγένετ' ἂν, ἀθηναῖοι, τὴν πρώτην ἐκείνην εἰρήνην ποιήσασθαι μετὰ κοινοῦ συνεδρίου τῶν Ἑλλήνων... ... καὶ προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου παρ' ἑκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπολαβεῖν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν

Dinarchus I. 37: ὧν τοὺς μὲν ἀρχαίους ἐκείνους μακρὸν ἂν εἴη λέγειν, Ἀριστείδην καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα, τοὺς ὀρθώσαντας τὰ τείχη τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοὺς φόρους εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἀνενεγκόντας παρ' ἑκόντων καὶ βουλομένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων

The above [illegible] [illegible] these passages [illegible] [illegible] genitive absolute would be [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

the following passages from Thucydides

Thuc. I, 96, 1: παραλαβόντες δὲ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ ἑκόντων τῶν ξυμμάχων διὰ τὸ Παυσανίου μῖσος, etc.

" VI. 76, 3: ἡγεμόνες γὰρ γενόμενοι ἑκόντων τῶν τε Ἰώνων καὶ ὅσοι ἀπὸ σφῶν ἦσαν ξύμμαχοι ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Μήδου τιμωρίᾳ, etc.

(5) Lycurgus:—

Lycurgus 144: Ποία δὲ ἡλικία δικαίως ἂν τοῦτον ἐλεήσειε; πότερον ἡ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; ἀλλ' οὐδὲ γηροτροφηθῆναι οὐδ' ἐν ἐλευθέρῳ ἐδάφει τῆς πατρίδος αὐτοῖς ταφῆναι τὸ καθ' αὑτὸν μέρος παρέδωκεν.

No instances of the prepositional type of predication occur in Lycurgus, who has shown a remarkable preference for different forms of the predication, as we have already seen, unless we accept in the passage cited above the emendation [illegible]

posed by Dobree[1]. Maetzner[2] notes Dobree's proposed emendation, but does not adopt it. The editors read ἐν ἐλευθέρῳ ἐδάφει.

Dobree compares, for the Article, the use of τὴν in such an expression as εὐορκοτάτην τὴν ψῆφον ἐνεγκεῖν in § 13 Lyc. and elsewhere. Exactly similar to this, in his opinion, is Dem. 24, 56: ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ τῇ πόλει.

It is not merely a question, as Maetzner says, [illegible] the Article [illegible] δαφει [illegible] Dem. 8, 39: τῷ τῆς πόλεως ἐδάφει; Aeschin. 3, 134: περὶ τοῦ τῆς [illegible] etc. — it is a question as to whether the predicative position is necessary or not. The illustrations adduced by Dobree lack cogency to my mind.

[illegible], treating of Lycurgus's use of the Article, says that he [illegible] the Article with the power of the substantive, in proof of which he cites one passage in Lyc. 124 [illegible]

---

[1] Adversaria Critica, Berlin, 1874, vol. 1, p. 326.
[2] Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem, Berlin 1836. [illegible]
[3] [illegible]

this cannot be urged as an argument here.

I see no sufficient reason for departing from the received text in this instance. There is no special point to be gained by the use of the predicative construction here. The case is different in the other examples which I have been considering.

(b) Demosthenes:-

Let us note first adjectives which have a predicative position.

Demosthenes IV. 51: νῦν δ' ἐπ' ἀδήλοις οὖσι τοῖς ἀπὸ τούτων ἐμαυτῷ γενησομένοις, ὅμως ἐπὶ τῷ συνοίσειν ὑμῖν, ἂν πράξητε, ταῦτα πεπεῖσθαι λέγειν αἱροῦμαι.

Cf. ,, XXI. 30: οὐδ' ἐπειδὰν ἀδικηθῇ τις, ὡς ἂν ἕκαστος ὑμᾶς ὁ παθὼν πείσῃ, ποιεῖσθαι τὴν τιμωρίαν, ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον νόμους ἔθεσθε πρὸ τῶν ἀδικημάτων, ἐπ' ἀδήλοις μὲν τοῖς ἀδικήσουσιν, ἀδήλοις δὲ τοῖς ἠδικησομένοις.

Demosthenes XVIII. 298: ἐγὼ δέ σοι λέγω, ὅτι .....:

ἐμ᾽ οὔτε καιρὸς οὔτε φιλανθρωπία λόγων, οὔτ᾽ ἐπαγγελιῶν μέγεθος, οὔτ᾽ ἐλπὶς οὔτε φόβος οὔτ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ οὐδὲν ἐπῆρεν οὐδὲ προηγάγετο ..... οὐδὲν προδοῦναι, οὐδ᾽, ὅσα συμβεβούλευκα πώποτε τουτοισί, ὁμοίως ὑμῖν ὥσπερ πρυτάνῃ ῥέπων ἐπὶ τὸ λῆμμα [συμβεβούλευκα], ἀλλ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ὀρθῆς καὶ δικαίας κἀδιαφθόρου τῆς ψυχῆς ..... πάντ᾽ ὑγιῶς καὶ δικαίως [πεπολίτευμαι].

This is one of the most affected instances of the [illegible] construction. The adjectives which stand in the predicative position, independent as they are by themselves, are made the more impressive by virtue of this isolation.

[illegible] renders it: "my whole counsel was inspired by a spirit of rectitude, a spirit of justice and integrity."

Kennedy: "All my proceedings have been those of a soul upright, honest and incorruptible."

Pseudo-Lysias 2, 18: ἐλευθέραις ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐπολιτεύον

seems like a feeble echo of it.)

Demosthenes XVIII. 258: σὺ δ' ὁ σεμνὸς [ἀνὴρ] καὶ [illegible] τοὺς ἄλλους, [illegible] τὴν ποίᾳ τινὶ κέχρησαι τύχῃ, δι' ἣν παῖς μὲν ὢν μετὰ πολλῆς ἐνδείας ἐτράφης, etc.

Vömel reads μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐνδείας. He notes that the article is generally omitted. "τῆς Σ, unde Schaeferus in Gr. Attic. p. 6 omisit, at habet [illegible] Σ, πολλῆς τῆς i.e. πολλὴ ἦν ἡ ἔνδεια μεθ' ἧς ἐτράφης."

Blass is doubtful, but reads τῆς in the attributive position.

Here the predicative position with πολλῆς would be eminently appropriate, as it serves to give even more point to the statement Demosthenes makes of Aeschines' boyhood.

For a similar use of πολύς, cf. Thuc. 8,38: ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς πάνυ μάχαις. [illegible] Greek seems to have been the [illegible].

2 Isocrates XV. [illegible]

μηδενὶ μηδὲν ἐξεῖναι τοιοῦτο ποιεῖν, ὡς ὑπὲρ κοινοῦ τοῦ πράγματος ὄντος καὶ ἀκροασάτω, καὶ τὰ φαινόμεν' αὐτῷ δικαιότατ' εἶναι ταῦτα ψηφισάσθω.

The underlined portion of this section has occasioned difficulty among interpreters.

Baiter suggests that the [illegible] and reverses the construction as follows: ἀκουσάτω ὑπὲρ τοῦ πράγματος ὡς κοινοῦ ὄντος "Let him then give an attentive hearing to the matter as one of public interest." This does not seem natural.

Havet translates "considering that the cause is of public interest". The literal sense, he says, is: "considering that (he is giving his attention) in behalf of the cause as being of public interest." Havet notes that the difficulty has generally been passed over.

No one, it may be mentioned, has ventured to apply the principle which was referred to in the case of Isocr. 1, 34 ὡς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου τοῦ πράγματος. According to it,

ὡς ὑπὲρ κοινοῦ τοῦ πράγματος ὄντος = ὑπὲρ τοῦ πράγματος ὡς ὑπὲρ κοινοῦ (sc. πράγματος). As to ὄντος, I do not know what would be done with it.

To my mind, the translation given by Kennedy "and they considering themselves that the case is one of general interest" is correct. Still one may translate correctly without a clear conception of the construction. The explanation I should offer is simply this. κοινοῦ is a predicative adjective having, as usual, the main emphasis. ὄντος is the copula which is much more frequently omitted, as we observe, in this construction.

Cf. Demosthenes XXXV. 22: [illegible]
ἔλαθον δανεισάμενοι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμετέροις, ἐκεῖνόν τε τὸν νεανίσκον τὸν ὑπογράψαντα ἐξηπάτησαν ὡς ἐπ' ἐλευθέροις τοῖς χρήμασι δανειζόμενοι.

Kennedy: "leading him to suppose that the property on which they borrowed his money was unencumbered".

Here [illegible] predicative adjective [illegible] ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασι ὡς οὖσι ἐλευθέροις, [illegible]

Demosthenes XXXVI. 8: ἀπαξιοῦντες δὲ τοῦτον καὶ πολλὰ ἀπὸ
κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων ἀναλίσκειν οἰόμενοι δεῖν,
λογιζόμενοι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς οἱ ἐπίτροποι, ὅτι
εἰ δεήσει κατὰ τὰς διαθήκας, ὅσ᾽ ἂν οὗτος ἐκ
κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων ἀναλώσῃ, τούτων ἐκείνῳ
ἀντιμοιρεὶ τὰ λοιπὰ νέμειν, κ.τ.ε.

" XXXVI. 39: ἀλλ᾽ ἃ μὲν ἐκ κοινῶν ἐλῃτούργεις
τῶν χρημάτων, σὺ καὶ ἁδελφὸς ἀνηλώσατε·

In the first example, Dindorf read ἀπὸ κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων ὄντων. This is also the reading of Sandys and Paley(1). Blass omits ὄντων with MSS. FQ. He is influenced by the similar use of ἐκ κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων in §§ 8 and 39 without ὄντων. We have already had occasion to note that this form is quite unnecessary, though sometimes added, to the construction.

We find the following examples of the predicative participle.

Demosthenes XVIII. 205: ὅτι ὁ μὲν τοῖς γονεῦσι μόνον γε-
γενῆσθαι νομίζων, τὸν τῆς εἱμαρμένης καὶ τὸν αὐ-
τόματον θάνατον περιμένει, ὁ δὲ καὶ τῇ πατρίδι, ὑ-
πὲρ τοῦ μὴ ταύτην ἐπιδεῖν δουλεύουσαν, ἀπο-

---

(1) Edition of Private Orations of Demosthenes, Selected. Part II., Cambridge, 18[illegible].

θνήσκειν ἐθελήσει, καὶ φοβερωτέρας ἡγήσεται τὰς ὕβρεις καὶ τὰς ἀτιμίας, ἃς ἐν δουλευούσῃ τῇ πόλει φέρειν ἀνάγκη.

The context with its prominent ideas contained in the words δουλεύειν and μετ' ἐλευθερίας ζῆν prepares us for the emphatic δουλευούσῃ above. We are reminded by the form of

Demosthenes XXIV. 56: ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ τῇ πόλει

Cf. also Dem. 24.76. This phrase has already [illegible] Andocides. In reality they are different, for the ἐν of our passage has a local sense, whereas in Dem. 24, 56 the sense is [illegible].

Drake aptly compares Herodotus V. 29: ἐν ἀνεστηκυίῃ τῇ χώρῃ which we have already noted, comparing Xenophon, Cyr. 1, 3, 3: ἐν ὀρεινῇ οὔσῃ τῇ χώρᾳ.

In late Greek, we may compare

Lucian, Timon 57: ὦ δημοκρατία καὶ νόμοι, παιόμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ καταράτου ἐν ἐλευθέρᾳ τῇ πόλει.

Cf., for the same expression, Hyperides 13 [illegible].

Demosth. XIX. 120: ἐς γὰρ ἀγῶνας κοινοὺς ὥσπερ δράματα,
καὶ τούτους ἀμαρτύρους, πρὸς διαμεμετρημέ-
νην τὴν ἡμέραν αἱρεῖς διώκων, δῆλον ὅτι πάν-
τες [illegible].

Cf. Idem. LIII. 17: ἡμέραις δ' οὐ πολλαῖς ὕστερον εἰσελθὼν
εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον πρὸς ἡμέραν διαμεμετρημέ-
νην, etc.

and Aeschines II. 126: ἐνδέχεται δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν μέρος τῆς ἡμέ-
ρας ταῦτα πρᾶξαι· πρὸς ἕνδεκα γὰρ ἀμφορέας
ἐν διαμεμετρημένῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κρίνομαι.

[illegible] expression, [illegible], of which we
learn from Harpocration and Suidas (who borrows from H.).
The judicial day was measured out and divided into three
portions, one allotted to the plaintiff, another to the defendant,
and the third to the judges.

Demosthenes XX. 16: ὑπὸ τῶν ὁμοίων [illegible]

" XXXVII. [illegible]

[illegible]

[Demosthenes XXIV. 98: πῶς οὖν οὐχ ἅπαντ' ἀνάγκη καταλυθῆναι τὰ τῆς πόλεως, ὅταν αἱ μὲν τῶν τελῶν καταβολαὶ μὴ ὦσ' ἱκαναὶ τῇ διοικήσει, ἀλλ' ἐνδεῇ πολλῶν, καὶ μηδὲ ταῦτ' ἀλλ' ἢ περὶ λήγοντα τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ᾖ λαβεῖν, etc.

[illegible] but with it we may compare ἅμα ἡλίῳ δύνοντι, περὶ πλήθουσαν ἀγοράν, and the like.]

(7) Aeschines :-

Aeschines III. 255: μὴ οὖν ὡς ὑπὲρ ἀλλοτρίας, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὲρ οἰκείας τῆς πόλεως βουλεύεσθε, etc.

MSS. e h k l give περί for ὑπέρ in both places. Weidner reads περί for the first ὑπέρ.

Again the principle which was applied to ὡς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου τοῦ πράγματος is inapplicable or, at any rate, pointless.

Aeschines III. 58: περὶ ἑκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων

" III. 156: ἐν διαμεμετρημένῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

These have already been noticed.

c) Dinarchus:

Dinarchus i, 37: παρ' ἑκόντων καὶ βουλομένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων

This example has already been noticed as one of a group under the Herodotean use of participles.

We have now completed our survey of the Historians and the Orators so far as the prepositional type of oblique predication is concerned. In the table submitted in the chapter on Oblique Predication in the Attic Orators, we had occasion to note how restricted the range of this type was in the Orators. The detailed examination of the examples which we have considered shows furthermore the phraseological character of a considerable number of them. It is also worth noting that it is Thucydides of the Historians and Demosthenes of the Orators who more particularly favor this construction. We should not be inclined to lay stress on the fact that

their usage is not widely dissimilar, so far as the percentage of occurrences is concerned. E.g. we find 10 examples in Thucydides in 596 pages = ·017, and 17 examples in Demosthenes in 768 pages = ·02. The coincidence, however, is by no means the result of chance. The writer thinks it is in large measure due to Demosthenes careful study of the language of Thucydides, study which was very far from resulting in slavish imitation, but was successful, with reference to this type, in lending to his style that impressiveness which was the natural reflex of his gifted mind.

Now that we have studied the usage of classical Greek within the bounds already defined, it remains for us to complete our study by an examination of the usage of late Greek, taking Lucian as our standard for this period.

Prepositional Type
of Predication
in Late Greek

Late Prose.

With the limited use of the classical period, as we have seen in the tabulated statement, stands in decided contrast that of late prose, especially in the usage of certain authors. We can perhaps show this most clearly by arranging our material [illegible] in certain groups as follows:-

(1) Examples [illegible] by the [illegible].

It was Thucydides, we saw, who showed among the [illegible] a fondness for this preposition in [illegible] construction. Let us compare [illegible] [illegible] Lucian [illegible]

Thucydides 1,36,1: ἀσθενὲς ὂν πρὸς ἰσχύοντας τοὺς ἐχθ.
1,84,3: πρὸς τὸ βουλευόμενον [illegible].
3,43,4: πρὸς ἀνεύθυνον τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀκρό-

(2)

Opposition, or contrast, is expressed by means of the preposition in these examples.

Lucian Timon 2: πρὸς [illegible]

[illegible] 38: πρὸς [illegible] τὸ [illegible]

Pro Imag. 16: πρὸς οὕτω σφοδρὰν [illegible]

Toxaris 27: πρὸς οὕτω σκληρὰν τὴν [illegible]

Gallus 29: πρὸς ἀμαυράν τε καὶ [illegible] τὴν [illegible]

Bis Accus. 20: πρὸς εὐπρόσωπον καὶ τὴν ἀντίδικον

Rhet. Praec. 23: πρὸς οὕτω πολλοὺς τοὺς [illegible]

De Electro 3: πρὸς ἐναντίον τὸ ὕδωρ

De Domo 29: πρὸς οὕτω καλὰς καὶ ποικίλας τὰς ὑποθέσεις

Navigium 9: πρὸς ἀντίους τοὺς ἐτησίας

Saturnalia 7: πρὸς οὕτω πολλὴν τὴν ἀδικίαν

[illegible]: πρὸς [illegible] τὸ [illegible] δόξαν.

Here, too, opposition, or contrast, is expressed by the preposition, except in the case of the first example, where πρός denotes direction. It must [illegible] that the Greek of Lucian is [illegible]

that of Thucydides. Still every [illegible] will [illegible] feel that the [illegible] [illegible] of this [illegible], has [illegible] a [illegible]. Remove the [illegible] in a number of [illegible], and nothing is lost to the [illegible]. This cannot be done in the case of Thucydides.

(2) Except the examples cited from Lucian, which I [illegible] cited, have the adjective πολὺς in the predicative position. I have found only two cases of this in the standard writers, one from Thucydides,

Thuc. VIII. 38,3: ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς πρὶν μάχαις.

the other from Demosthenes,

Dem. XVIII. 238: μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐνδείας ἐπράξας.

The latter is a disputed case. Blass omits the article. But what a contrast is presented to us in Lucian! There are fifteen additional cases in which πολύς stands predicatively. The attributive position with the article was noticed but once viz,

Luc. Hermotimus 2; ἐν τῷ πολλῷ [illegible]

The group is as follows: -

Lucian, Timon 13: ἐν πολλῷ τῷ σκότῳ
" Charon 11: ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ βάθους
Quom. Hist. Conscr. 1: ἐν πολλῷ τῷ φλογμῷ
Alexander 51: ἐν πολλῇ τῇ σιωπῇ
" [illegible]
De Saltatione 40: ἐκ πολλῶν τῶν παραλελειμμένων
" Demonax 31: μετὰ πολλῶν τῶν μαθητῶν
" Gallus 19: ἐν πολλῇ τῇ περιόδῳ
" Rhet. Praec. 3: σὺν πολλῇ τῇ [illegible] καὶ τρυφῇ
" Hippias 7: ὑπὸ φωτὶ μεγάλῳ καὶ πολλῇ τῇ εἴσω ἡμέρᾳ
" Advers. Indoct. 19: ἐκ πολλῆς τῆς περιουσίας
" 2: [illegible]
" De Dipsadibus 2: ὑπὸ πολλῷ καὶ ὀξεῖ τῷ ἡλίῳ
" Dial. Mort. 14, 2: μετὰ πολλῆς γε τῆς μάχης
" De Morte Peregr. 19: ἐν πολλῷ τῷ πλήθει
Compare with this .. Gallus [illegible]: ἐν [illegible]
.. Icaromenippus 17: ἐν αὐτῷ γε πολλῷ καὶ [illegible]
[illegible]

We might naturally expect, as πολύς occurs so frequently, to find its opposite ὀλίγος, or μικρός and the like. They do occur, but not often.

Lucian, Anacharsis 11: ἐπ' ὀλίγων τῶν μαθητῶν

Hermotimus 61: ἀπ' ὀλίγου τοῦ γεύματος

The latter usage is interesting inasmuch as we have, in the same chapter, the attributive position with the Article.

After a reference to the different qualities of wine which one could taste and compare and thoroughly test, the question is asked: καὶ ἀπό γε τοῦ ὀλίγου ἐκείνου γεύματος ἂν εἰδείης ὅτι τοιοῦτος ὁ οἶνος ἐστιν;

Here the Article is plainly anaphoric, strengthened, it is here, by the demonstrative ἐκεῖνος.

The image is soon transferred to philosophy and the question is asked: τί δεῖ ἐκπιεῖν τὸν πίθον δυναμένους γε ἀπ' ὀλίγου τοῦ γεύματος εἰδέναι ὁποῖον τὸ πᾶν ἐστι;

The Article is not anaphoric here. The figure has changed. If the Article is omitted, the sense is conveyed equally as well. And this is what would have been done in classical

In other words, Lucian is giving predicative expression to what is really an attributive relation, in this case and in the group already cited.

Compare ἐπ' ὀλίγων τῶν μαρτύρων with

Xen. Hell. 6,4,1: ἐπ' ὀλίγων μοι δοκοῦσι μαρτύρων

We may note also the similar use of μακρός by Lucian

Lucian Deor. Dial. 10,2: ὑπὸ μακρῷ τῷ ζόφῳ

" De Merc. Cond. 37: διὰ μακροῦ τοῦ χρόνου

" Jupp. Confut. 4: ὑπὸ μακρῷ τῷ λίνῳ

" Navigium 44: ἐν μακρῷ τῷ βίῳ

With these groups of examples may be compared the following from Aelian, given by Schmid[1]

Aelian NA 34,6: ἐν μακρῷ τῷ χρόνῳ

" 36,3: κατὰ πολλὴν τὴν εἰρήνην

" 47,24: ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ αἰθέρος καὶ ὑψηλοῦ

" 112,30: κατὰ πολλὴν τὴν σπουδήν

(3) Several of the adjectives [illegible] in the [illegible] position [illegible] are accompanied by the preposition ὑπό [illegible]. Some of these have already been noted in the preceding groups. Additional examples are:

---

[1] Atticismus, vol. III. p. 63.

Lucian, De Merc. Conduct. 23 : ὑπὸ μεγαλοφώνῳ τῷ κήρυκι
" Herodotus 6 : ὑπὸ νυμφαγωγῷ τῷ [illegible]
" Quom. Hist. Conscr. 2 : ὑπὸ μιᾷ τῇ ὁρμῇ. Cf. Anachar. 26
Luc. also uses μιᾷ ὁρμῇ and ἀπὸ μιᾶς ὁρμῆς
" Phalaris II. 8 : ὑπὸ γεωργῷ τῷ θεῷ
" [illegible] 12 : ὑπὸ π[illegible] τῇ [illegible]
" Pseudologista 17 : ὑπὸ πονηρῷ τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ δυσφήμῳ κληδονίσματι.
" Navigium 11 : ὑπὸ λαμπρᾷ τῇ δᾳδί

No instance occurs, in the classical authors which we have examined, of ὑπό c. dat. in this construction.

(4) The preposition most commonly employed in this type, alike in Classic and late Greek, is ἐν. In addition to the examples cited in the connections, we may note:-

Lucian, Timon 13 : ἐν χαλκῷ ἢ σιδηρῷ τῷ θαλάμῳ
" De Merc. Cond. 22 : ἐν ἀμυδρῷ τῷ φωτί Cf. Alexander 17.
" [illegible] 8 : ἐν οὕτως [illegible] τῇ [illegible]
" Quom. Hist. Conscr. 4 : ἐν οὕτω πολυφώνῳ τῷ καιρῷ

(5) The preposition ἐπί c. dat. is quite common in this type. Sometimes

none of the Classical writers considered unknown of it –

Lucian, Hermotimus 74: ἐπὶ σαθροῖς τοῖς θεμελίοις πύργοις
" Quom. Hist. Conscr. 35: ἐφ' οὕτω μεγάλῳ καὶ χαλεπῷ τῷ πράγματι.
" Demonax 8: ἐπ' ὀλιγοχρονίοις τοῖς δοκοῦσιν ἀγαθοῖς
" Toxaris 35: ἐπὶ προδήλῳ τῷ μικρὸν ὕστερον λυθήσεσθαι
" " 41: ἐπὶ τυφλῷ τῷ Δανδάμιδι
Jupp. Trag. 31: ἐφ' οὕτω σαφεῖ καὶ προδήλῳ τῷ χρησμῷ
" Rhet. Praec. 24: ἐπὶ ψιλῷ τῷ τρέφεσθαι
" Pseudologista 26: ἐπὶ πεπραγμένῳ ἤδη τῷ ἔργῳ
" De Domo 1: ἐπὶ προδήλῳ τῇ νόσῳ
Epist. Saturn. 35: ἐπὶ κατεαγότι τῷ ἀμφορεῖ

We note especially in the above list the occurrence of the Articular Infinitive with the adjective in the predicate position. This construction is not found in the Historians or Orators.

(6) Finally we note a small prepositional group which approaches in significance the Adverbial-Dative group treated in a previous chapter. Lucian, Hermotimus 11: ἐπὶ γωνίᾳ [illegible]
" Toxaris 19: ἀπὸ ψιλῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς.
" " 60: ἀπὸ γυμνῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς

We have now concluded our examination of the usage of late Greek, especially that of Lucian who, as we see, exhibits a marked fondness for the predicative position. This is true both of oblique predication in general and of the type we have examined in particular. To a certain extent especially in the case of the [illegible] types he has followed classical models; but he has extended the usage far beyond the bounds of Attic restraint. Substantially correct, in this connection, are the words of [illegible][1]: "Proprium hoc usque Luciani [illegible] frequentius quam alii scriptores articulum inter adiectivum et substantivum ponit, et ita quidem, ut articulus nonnunquam adiectivum antecedat, multo saepius integra sententia omitti possit. Cum [illegible] sequitur, quam si fractionitur, quasi ita saepe magis [illegible]tur, si articulus usurpatur, quam si omittitur."

---

(1) De Subditi qui inter Lucianeos legi solet [illegible]

Conclusion

Having reached the end of our investigation, we may summarize our results as follows. After noticing the nature and the form-function of the Greek, and the different functions of the adjective, attributive and predicative, the latter theme, we proceeded to the consideration of the predicative position as it is called, in which, both in the casus rectus and the oblique cases, the Article plays an important part. We next presented a general view of the usage of Oblique Predication by the authors, with the result that we saw that [illegible] of the [illegible] out from the [illegible], and [illegible] from the [illegible] the conclusion that epideictic [illegible] was its [illegible] self. We then proceeded to discuss the [illegible] of the adverbial Dative and prepositional types of Oblique Predication. In dealing with the usage of the former type, we attempted to show that it arose in Homer in what is called the Instrumental but what we prefer to call the Sociative Dative. Clasen's theory was rejected as untenable. Ex-

amining the classical usage of this type, we found that a large majority of the instances [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] with the [illegible] [illegible] part. This shows us the true sphere of the construction. A comparison with post-classical Greek clearly shows that while [illegible] [illegible] for the [illegible] of the construction, it was lacking so far as range of usage is concerned. This we ascribe to affectation on Lucian's part. In the case of the prepositional type, we [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] its affinity with the genitive absolute. Among the classical writers we notice that Thucydides and Xenophon [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] than the other type. Many expressions had become proverbial. Wider in its range than the classical, it was more freely extended by Lucian who used it in connection [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] part in both types.

Vita.

Alfred William Milden was born in [illegible], Ontario, on March 11, 1868. His preliminary education was received in the Public [illegible] and the High [illegible] of [illegible]. He [illegible] the [illegible] of Toronto in the year 1884 and, four years [illegible], [illegible] with the degree of [illegible], with honors in [illegible].

For a period of [illegible] years he was engaged in the [illegible]ing of classics, mainly in the Collegiate [illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible] he entered the [illegible]. [illegible] a post-graduate [illegible] in Greek, Latin [illegible] the [illegible] of his [illegible] [illegible] at the end of his [illegible] year [illegible] he received the [illegible] Doctor of [illegible]. During [illegible] [illegible] He has attended [illegible]

He would especially mention Professor Gildersleeve and Professor Miller, to the former of whom, in common with his many students, he must express the strong sense of his indebtedness for inspiration, guidance, and encouragement in the prosecution of his studies.

ARCHIVAL
COPY
NON-CIRC.